DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 070 RC 011 791

TITLE	Basic Skills Learning Centers Project. Annual Report for the Period October 1, 1978 - September 30, 1979.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Community Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 Oct 78
CONTRACT	CSA-B6B-5525
NOTE	104p.; For related documents, see RC 011 789-790 and RC 011 792-793
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Annual Reports; Basic Reading; *Basic Skills; Bilingual Education; Delivery Systems; Elementary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Materials; *Learning Laboratories; Letters (Correspondence); Organizational Communication; Program Costs; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Remedial Instruction; Remedial Mathematics; *Rural Schools; School Demography; Small Schools; Socioeconomic Background; *Spanish Speaking; Student Records
IDENTIFIERS	*Basic Skills Learning Centers Project; Louisiana; United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

Program implementation is stressed in this final report of a three-year Basic Skills Learning Centers (BSLC) Project designed (1) to improve basic skills in reading, math, and reasoning and (2) to serve a target population of Spanish-speaking children from nonurban schools in five southwestern states. Section I is the annual report for 1978-79 and summarizes the year's activities, with emphasis on field services, staff training, and communication with participating schools. Covering the entire period from 1976-1979, Section II includes an overview of the project, its goals and target audience; a description of the programs and materials and their method of implementation; and a summary of the major strategies used to help the schools implement the programs. Numbers of students participating and student characteristics are included in this section. Use of bilingual instructional staff is discussed, and some problems with student record keeping procedures and delivery of services to rural school districts are pointed out. Section III covers the three years of the Louisiana Component of the project, which served English-speaking children from 45 schools in 6 parishes. Appendices contain correspondence documenting the activities of the 1978-79 fourth quarter and tabular material showing pupil progress and projected use of BSLC materials in 1979-80, when federal support for the program will not be available. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182070

4 JAN 1980 ERIC/CRESS RECEIVED

Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

Annual Report
for the period
October 1, 1978 – September 30, 1979

Submitted To:

Community Services Administration

From:

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

RC 011791

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Kunetka

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

September 28, 1979

Ms. Devra Bloom, Program Manager
Office of Program Development
Community Services Administration
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dear Ms. Bloom:

Submitted herewith are an original and three copies of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's performance report for the period October 1, 1978, through September 30, 1979, required under the provisions of Clause I, Statement of Work, Reporting Requirements 2, of Contract No. B6B-5525 (as amended by the July 2, 1979 Modification No. 3). As you requested in your August 2, 1979, letter to me, this report addresses SEDL's total experience with the three-year project.

Accordingly this report differs somewhat from the format utilized in all previous SEDL/BSLC reports. Section I is the annual report for 1978-79, summarizing the year's activities. Section II is a brief report summarizing the entire period September 30, 1976 to September 30, 1979. Section III is a final report covering the three years of the Louisiana Component of the project. Specific materials documenting activities in the 1978-79 fourth quarter, which was the one time segment not covered by a separate report (as per the July 2, 1979 modification), are included in the attachments.

SEDL believes that the vast majority, if not all, of the pupils derived substantial benefits from participating in the project. In addition, teachers, aides, principals, and other participating site personnel gained new insights and capabilities concerning the effective use of high-quality R&D based materials and techniques. CSA is to be congratulated for its sponsorship of such a worthy endeavor. SEDL is very pleased to have been selected to participate in the effort.

If there are questions concerning any of the above, or if we can be of assistance in other ways, please call Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky.

Sincerely,

James H. Perry

James H. Perry
Executive Director

JHP:bd

Enclosures: (4)

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky
Ms. Rebeca R. Zuñiga
Mr. Arnold W. Kriegel
Dr. Richard E. Schutz, SWRL
Mr. Frank Capell, CSE

SEDL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
I.	ANNUAL REPORT 1978-79	2
	ADMINISTRATION	2
	FIELD SERVICES AND TRAINING	4
	DEVELOPMENT	7
	EVALUATION	8
	NUMBER OF TEACHERS AND PUPILS	9
	TEACHER INFORMATION	9
	MATERIALS	9
	TABLE 1 and 2	10
	HOTLINE	11
	CONCLUSIONS	11
II.	THREE YEAR SUMMARY REPORT 1976-1979	12
	BACKGROUND	12
	DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	12
	TABLE 3 and 4	13
	LEARNING PROCESS AND MATERIALS	14
	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND PUPILS SERVED	15
	TABLE 5 and 6	16
	PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	17
	TEACHERS	17
	TABLE 7	17
	PHYSICAL PLAN	18
	MATERIALS	18
	PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY	18
	STAFF TRAINING	19

Page

PUPIL PROGRESS. 19

TABLE 8 20

SPECIAL ASPECTS OF PROJECT. 21

Clusters 21

PPIFs. 23

Hotline. 24

Coordination among Training, Reporting and Testing Activities 25

TABLE 9. 25

STAFF EXPERIENCES AND IMPRESSIONS 26

CONCLUSIONS 28

III. SEDL/LOUISIANA BSLC COMPONENT. 30

Target Audience. 30

Program. 30

Project Sites. 30

Program Implementation 31

Materials. 32

ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT A: Letters documenting Fourth Quarterly Report, 1978-79 34

ATTACHMENT B: Districts Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination 62

ATTACHMENT C: Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979, by Program, by District by State. 74

ATTACHMENT D: Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and 1979-80 by Program, by State 91

ATTACHMENT E: Persons Attending SEDL Training by Roles, Numbers submitting BSLC Reports, Numbers conducting CSE Testing. 97

INTRODUCTION

The third and final year of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) Basic Skills Learning Centers Project was completed September 30, 1979. Generated by the increasingly apparent need for children to learn basic educational skills, the project was funded by the Community Services Administration (CSA).

Each year since the project's inception on September 30, 1976, SEDL has submitted quarterly reports to CSA, delineating goals and objectives, plans, accomplishments, and other details of the program. In addition, following the terms of the contract (B6B-5525), SEDL has submitted an annual report at the end of each of the first two years of the project, summarizing the year's activities.

This year's annual report is submitted in an expanded format in order to include summary observations about the entire three-year project. Section I is the annual report for 1978-79, summarizing the year's activities. Section II is a brief report summarizing the entire period September 30, 1976 to September 30, 1979. In this second section is an overview of the project, its goals and target audience; a description of the programs and materials used and their method of implementation; and a summary of the major strategies used to help the schools implement the programs as well as some staff experiences and impressions gained from working with the project. Data on project participants for school years 1977-78 and 1978-79 are included in this section. Section III is a final report covering the three years of the Louisiana Component of the project. Specific materials documenting activities in the 1978-79 fourth quarter, which was the one time segment not covered by a separate report (as per the July 2, 1979 modification No. 3 to the contract), are included in the attachments.

SECTION I

SEDL/BSLC PROJECT
ANNUAL REPORT
1978-79

Following is a summary of the significant accomplishments, by quarter, of the 1978-79 SEDL/BSLC Project implemented in five Southwestern states--Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. A complete review of the first three quarters' activities is provided in the previously submitted 1978-79 quarterly reports.

ADMINISTRATION

First Quarter:

In addition to routine administrative functions, Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) representatives joined SEDL staff at several fall inservice sessions.

Concerns of the sites: need for more instructional materials and teacher materials, need for more time to address personnel problems related to support staff who were not trained and were monolingual (English speaking only).

Second Quarter:

Staff from CSE, CSA, SEDL, and the National Institute of Education (NIE) attended an evaluation session at CSE headquarters in Los Angeles; copies of the ninth quarterly report were completed and distributed; the revised annual report (1977-78) was completed and distributed; and two staff changes were made. Communication between SEDL and the project sites was kept open by frequent letters from SEDL to (1) BSLC coordinators, reminding them of the due date for Pupil Program Information Forms; (2) superintendents of six BSLC districts, concerning the use and non-use of the program materials, and (3) BSLC coordinators, explaining the computer printouts.

Concerns of the sites: details of completing Pupil Program Information Forms.

Third Quarter:

In a meeting attended by CSE and SEDL staff, participants discussed CSE's Spring, 1979 testing efforts; summarized the recently completed BSLC evaluation activities by CSE; and discussed the evaluation-based guidance to SEDL/BSLC staff regarding planning for activities through the end of the contract period. Communication included letters to (1) BSLC coordinators, explaining January, 1979 computer printouts (a continuation activity from the previous quarter); (2) BSLC coordinators, encouraging them to cooperate with CSE's surveys and to administer the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) tests; (3) CSE, with Bilingual Continuous Progress Mathematics (BCPM) computer printouts with May, 1979 information; and (4) Devra Bloom and Rosemarie Babel concerning administrative functions.

Concerns of the sites: wanted to know if, for the following year (i.e., 1979-80) they could keep BSLC materials, obtain additional materials, and have training sessions, and if SEDL staff would train individual districts and assist them with their problems. These concerns anticipated the project termination on September 30, 1979.

Fourth Quarter:

Communication with sites was maintained consistently throughout project via phone calls and letters. Basically the calls were for information, material allocations, costs, plans, and courtesy (thanking sites for participating in training). On another level, the calls provided the encouragement and cooperation that enhanced program interest and implementation. (Letters representing fourth quarter contacts and thus not previously submitted appear in Attachment A).

Concerns of the sites: would the sites be able to continue the program and how long could SEDL supply BSLC materials.

(Note: Project Director, Preston Kronkosky, visited some of the BSLC sites in two Louisiana parishes, St. James and St. Landry, to observe first hand the project implementation in a sample of Louisiana parishes, to interact with staff members on site, and to get direct feedback from those BSLC participants.)

FIELD SERVICES AND TRAINING

Field services and training included three types of training: 1) Inservice sessions provided to each cluster dealing with each district's adaptation of the BSLC programs and facilitating the development of problem-solving capabilities; 2) BSLC preschool training provided to clusters dealing with specific skills for program implementation; and 3) individual school training dealing with specific content areas and individual needs, provided on request only if additional travel was not necessitated.

First Quarter:

SEDL staff determined the type of inservice that was most needed, and decided that more direct contact and involvement of local school administrators, principals, and resource people was needed. (Across BSLC sites, those with the strongest programs attributed their success to strong administrative support.) SEDL staff contacted BSLC coordinators to verify ideas and obtain suggestions for implementation of inservice plans, deciding on half-day sessions, as these were better for principals. Host sites were selected to be convenient to other sites in the "cluster."

Inservice sessions were held at seven "cluster" locations in November: Northern Arizona (Peoria), Southern Arizona (Sunnyside), Northern Colorado (Greeley), Southern Colorado and Northern New Mexico (Raton), Northern California (Tulare), Southern California (Brawley), and South Texas (La Joya). Inservice

focused on helping BSLC districts identify priorities, design alternative ways to deal with problems and weaknesses in project implementation, and learn to develop realistic time lines. Follow-up phone calls and letters were made after fall inservice to facilitate districts meeting their goals.

Plans were made for spring inservice, with projected ideas based on results of fall inservice, follow-up and district suggestions. Staff decided upon one full day of training for each type of BSLC program being used at the sites. Materials requested were supplied; spring training was planned for new staff at the sites (primarily because of site staff turnover). On-site training in BOLaR was held, on request, at Le Grand Union in Northern California.

Some districts expanded by requesting additional programs, but no new sites were added. Two districts, Coalinga and Selma, dropped out of the project; Selma returned to the project two weeks later.

BSLC staff briefed the faculties of education, mathematics, English, and early childhood at Southwest Texas State University, which had received a federal grant to start a Center for the Study of Basic Skills.

Second Quarter:

Arrangements were made for spring inservice. Spring inservice was held for "clusters" in El Valle, Texas, February 6; Northern Arizona, March 6; Southern Arizona, March 8; San Joaquin Valley, California, March 20; and Imperial Valley, California, March 22.

To ease the sites' transition following the end of the project, SEDL staff worked to enable all the sites to become as independent as possible. Materials were supplied, as requested. Pupil Program Information Forms were brought up to date.

Calipatria, California dropped out of the BSLC Project, and Woodville, California, and Santa Cruz, California dropped one BSLC program while maintaining one program.

Third Quarter:

Spring inservice was conducted for the following "clusters": Southern Colorado/Central New Mexico, April 3; Northern Colorado, April 5; West Texas, April 18; West New Mexico, April 24; South Central New Mexico, April 26.

Preschool training session plans were made for August and September. Sessions were scheduled for three days each. Handouts and training materials for the sessions were prepared and packaged in July.

Efforts to ease transition for project termination were stressed. Transition plans were built into preschool workshops, material allocations, and present and future project objectives and activities.

Fourth Quarter:

Handout and training materials for the preschool training sessions were prepared and packaged in July. Telephone calls were made to all sites regarding material allocations required/requested for the 1979-80 school year. Printed copies of the PPIF summaries were sent to each district in July. Each district received three copies: one for the district superintendent, one for the school principal, and one for the district coordinator.

Letters of thanks were sent to all participating superintendents and chief state school officers. The latter were informed of the total cost benefit in materials and staff development activities that SEDL's BSLC Project had provided to their respective states over the previous two school years.

Letters were sent to all district coordinators concerning the scheduled preschool workshops. In follow-up calls, SEDL staff determined the number of participants to expect at the workshops from each site. To ease transition for project termination, sites were urged to send new or untrained personnel to the training sessions. In addition, material needs of the schools were addressed.

Preschool training sessions were conducted in August and September for the following "clusters": Northern Colorado, August 7-9; Northern Arizona, August 21-23; South Central New Mexico, August 28-29; El Valle, Texas, September 5-7; Northern California, September 12-14; Southern California, September 17-19; and Winter Garden, Texas, September 25-26. The first two days of the sessions focused on program content, philosophy, methodology, and management. The third day used a new approach; instead of discussion, participants worked on and made the supplementary, reinforcement, and game activities essential to program instruction. In this way teachers and aides were better prepared to begin instruction at the start of the school year.

DEVELOPMENT

First Quarter:

Extra materials were allocated to districts that requested them as well as some districts received a program they did not have in the 1977-78 school year. The Personnel Information Form was developed by SEDL staff and sent to districts to obtain implementation information from school districts.

Second Quarter:

Additional materials were allocated during this quarter. Also information regarding inservice was sent to the BSLC site coordinators.

Third Quarter:

Districts were contacted by phone concerning their 1979-80 BSLC materials.

Fourth Quarter:

SEDL continued to allocate BSLC materials to the districts and also developed a plan with each district as to how these materials would be utilized after the end of the Project. (See Attachment B.)

EVALUATION

First Quarter:

1977-78 Fourth Quarter and Annual Reports were sent to other institutional project participants, as was information regarding changes in school district participation in the BSLC Project. A request for revision of the 1977-78 SEDL/BSLC Annual Report was received from CSA and work on report revision was begun by staff.

Second Quarter:

Revised 1977-78 SEDL/BSLC Annual Report was sent to other institutional project participants. Interim evaluation meeting was held at CSE for purpose of inter-agency communication regarding CSE's evaluation plans for the SEDL/BSLC Project.

Third Quarter:

Interaction between CSE and SEDL concerning CSE's implementation of an evaluation plan for the SEDL/BSLC Project was continued with a meeting at CSE. Main topics of discussion included CSE's Spring 1979 testing efforts, CSE's recently completed evaluation activities, and guidance to SEDL/BSLC staff regarding planning for project activities through the end of the contract period.

Fourth Quarter:

Project evaluation activities were focused on bringing the SEDL/BSLC Project to a conclusion. CSE's final evaluation report regarding the entire BSLC effort was received September 17, 1979, and reviewed by SEDL/BSLC staff members during the last two weeks of the contract period.

NUMBER OF TEACHERS AND PUPILS:

Despite the fact that generally the BSLC programs themselves were regarded as successful, ten fewer schools participated in the project in 1978-79, and thus there were fewer participating teachers and pupils. Nevertheless more students were exposed to a greater breadth of program materials and completed more content areas than in previous years. Table 1 indicates the number of teachers and pupils who participated in each of the programs in each of the five states. (Attachment C provides details on changes in program utilization by program, district and state.)

TEACHER INFORMATION:

Information about the training and relevant knowledge of the teachers in each training session was gathered on preschool information forms. One problem these forms revealed was that many of the teachers were new to the program, which meant that all training sessions had to be repeated from the previous year. Most of the teachers were somewhat reticent the first and second day of the workshop, but many were more open on the third day and became enthusiastic about the project. Some teachers expressed concern about obtaining materials or methods of presenting instruction, but most expressed no specific program needs.

MATERIALS:

SEDL involvement with the BSLC Project ended September 30, 1979. Nonetheless, a number of schools wanted to complete their sets of materials so they could continue the program in the 1979-80 school year. Table 2 indicates the number of sites in each state that used the three BSLC programs in 1978-79 and that requested materials to continue these programs in 1979-80. (Attachment D shows the materials allocated to each site, and Attachment B displays the districts' plans to utilize these materials following termination of the project.)

TABLE 1

SEDL/BSLC Participating Teachers and Pupils
by Program and by State during 1978-79

State	No. of BOLaR		No. of BCPM		No. of T&R		Total No. of	
	Teachers	Pupils	Teachers	Pupils	Teachers	Pupils	Teachers	Pupils
AZ	25	681	23	786	33	809	81	2276
CA	53	1232	39	1102	21	646	113	2980
CO	60	1221	40	815	26	600	132	2636
NM	69	1693	37	766	32	875	138	3334
TX	70	1975	29	909	21	797	120	3681
TOTAL	283	6802	168	4378	133	3727	584	14907

BOLaR - Bilingual Oral Language and Reading
BCPM - Bilingual Continuous Progress Mathematics
T&R - Thinking and Reasoning

TABLE 2

Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and
1979-80 by Program, by State

State	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R	
	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80
AZ	12	8	12	6	9	7
CA	14	11	14	7	7	5
CO	7	4	6	2	6	4
NM	5	5	4	4	6	3
TX	12	11	11	7	7	4
TOTAL	50	39	47	26	35	23

HOTLINE (i.e., Incoming WATS):

During July, August, and September approximately 60 calls per month were received on the Hotline. These calls were regarding preschool workshops, material requests, and questions on computer printouts. During the school year October 1978 - June 1979 approximately 100 calls per month were received which dealt with inservice workshops, PPIF deadlines, material requests, and program content.

CONCLUSIONS:

The third and final year of the SEDL/BSLC Project concentrated on staff orientation and training and on smoothing the participating schools' transition from SEDL support to no external support following termination of the project's Federal Funding. There were three 1978-79 training sessions--preschool (in the late summer); and two inservices, one in the fall and one in the spring. These were conducted to meet the needs expressed by participants at the end of the project's second year.

Throughout the year, communication between SEDL and the sites was maintained by letter and telephone communication. In addition, program materials were provided as requested/required. Transition efforts consisted of increased communication coupled with an effort to provide all program materials that might be needed by the sites for another year (i.e., 1979-80) of program usage. The preschool session conducted in the summer of 1979 also was oriented toward this goal. The fact that more than half the schools opted to continue the programs on their own attests to the success of the project.

SECTION II

THREE YEAR SUMMARY REPORT
SEDL/BSLC PROJECT
1976-1979

BACKGROUND

On September 30, 1979, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) completed the final year of a three-year contract with the Community Services Administration (CSA) to develop Basic Skills Learning Centers (BSLC) for children with special needs. The project's goal was to remediate (or prevent) learning difficulties in three basic subject areas: reading, mathematics and reasoning. The target audience was comprised of Spanish-speaking children from rural or non-urban school districts in five Southwestern states--Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas; and English-speaking children in Louisiana. The approach used was a blend of instructional environments and implementation processes designed for the early elementary grades. This report summarizes the three-year SEDL/BSLC Project, September 30, 1976 through September 30, 1979.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Children attending schools that served as SEDL/BSLC sites generally represented the target population the project was designed to serve. A large percentage were from families whose income was less than $9,000 per year; a majority were Spanish-surnamed. Tables 3 and 4 present the percent of low-income and Spanish-surnamed children who participated in the project in each state.

The overall average of pupils from low-income families across the five states was 72.5 percent; the project average of pupils with Spanish surnames was 64.6 percent.

TABLE 3

SEDL/BSLC Pupils from Low-Income Families

State	Average %
Arizona	48
California	71.3
Colorado	90.5
New Mexico	85.5
Texas	67.2
PROJECT AVERAGE	72.5

TABLE 4

SEDL/BSLC Pupils with Spanish Surnames

State	Average %
Arizona	38.9
California	68.5
Colorado	44.6
New Mexico	90.5
Texas	80.7
PROJECT AVERAGE	64.6

At the start of the project, pupil achievement levels at participating schools were low in both reading and math in comparison with the national average in those subjects. Project averages for all sites combined showed that 63 percent of the pupils scored in the bottom half of the national norm in reading, while 62 percent were in the bottom half in math.

Schools participating in the project ranged in size from a total staff of seven to a staff of 147 (both in Texas) with a wide range between these extremes. All were considered elementary schools, generally ranging from grades 1 through 6, though some extended slightly above and below these grade levels. Almost all of the schools (97 percent) qualified for ESEA Title I funds, and a vast majority had other remedial programs in addition to the BSLC Programs introduced by SEDL.

LEARNING PROCESS AND MATERIALS

The BSLC comprised a learning process used in conjunction with special materials. The process featured:

- Information Systems - materials and procedures that outlined the basic skills being taught and that provided teachers and staff with information on each pupil's achievement in a given skill.
- Learning Center Resources - instructional procedures, varied and individualized, that enabled children to learn the specified skills.
- Organizational Patterns - an individualized and flexible arrangement of physical and staff resources to meet each classroom's and pupil's needs.

Except for the materials used in Louisiana the materials for each program had been developed and tested by SEDL prior to the start of the BSLC Project. Each school was permitted to use one or more of the programs, the choice being determined by the school's needs. The materials included:

- Bilingual Oral Language and Reading (BOLaR) - a Spanish/English

program designed to develop the four basic communication skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing in both Spanish/ and English.

- Bilingual Continuous Progress Mathematics (BCPM) - a Spanish/ English program developed to teach basic math through an aural-visual rather than a reading approach.
- Thinking and Reasoning (T&R) - a program to develop analytic thinking and problem-solving skills through lesson and game activities.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND PUPILS SERVED

1976-1977 - Identification, orientation, and selection of participating districts, schools and pupils was completed as was other project planning, but no implementation took place.

1977-78 - BSLC was initially implemented in 66 districts involving 129 schools in five states--Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and six Parishes in Louisiana.

1978-79 - BSLC implementation was continued in 56 districts involving 86 schools in the same five states and 45 schools in six Louisiana Parishes.

Table 5 indicates the number of participating districts and schools by state during the two school years of project implementation. Table 6 indicates the number of pupils enrolled in each program in each state. It should be noted that for both years reported, the figures do not reflect a total number of different or "unique" pupils, as some children participated in more than one program. Data were based on PPIFs returned to SEDL and thus did not include sites that withdrew from the project or that neglected to complete and return the forms.

TABLE 5

Project Participants by States
1977-78 and 1978-79

State	Highest Number of Participating Districts		Schools	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
AZ	13	12	29	11
CA	19	18	27	22
CO	9	7	26	17
NM	6	6	17	15
TX	19	13	30	21
TOTALS	66	56	129	86

TABLE 6

Number of Pupils Enrolled in
SEDL/BSLC Programs
1977-78 and 1978-79

State	Highest Number of Pupils Enrolled during 1977-78 and 1978-79							
	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R		Total	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
AZ	1613	681	1225	786	931	809	3769	2276
CA	1278	1232	1338	1102	621	646	3237	2980
CO	1121	1221	894	815	623	600	2638	2636
NM	1906	1693	942	766	802	875	3650	3334
TX	1590	1975	1165	909	685	797	3440	3681
TOTALS	7508	6802	5564	4378	3662	3727	16,734	14,907

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

1976-77 - Planning and preparation. Districts were contacted and selected and preparations were made for starting Basic Skills Learning Centers.

1977-78 - Initiation, maintenance and improvement of BSLC. BSLCs were started in the schools, preschool and inservice training sessions were conducted and evaluated. Efforts were made to improve implementation and expand the number of districts served.

1978-79 - Continued maintenance, improvement, and transition of BSLC. SEDL staff concentrated on providing training as needed and requested and on easing the transition for the schools when the project terminated.

TEACHERS

The SEDL/BSLC Project was a flexible program, designed so that it could be adapted to different types of classes and school settings. Therefore, project implementation followed no rigidly predetermined pattern, but was adapted to suit the needs of each district and school. The curricula were taught primarily by regular classroom teachers with the help of bilingual aides. The number of teachers by program and state is indicated in Table 7 below.

TABLE 7

Number of Teachers that Participated in the BSLC Project by Program and State

State	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R		Total	
	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79	1977-78	1978-79
AZ	61	25	45	23	32	33	138	81
CA	42	53	43	39	19	21	104	113
CO	51	66	38	40	23	26	112	132
NM	73	69	44	37	33	32	150	138
TX	57	70	45	29	18	21	120	120
Total	284	283	215	168	125	133	624	584

The pattern of one teacher and one bilingual aide per classroom, while the most common approach, was not the only implementation method. Some sites incorporated special resource staff and/or volunteer aides to assist regular teachers. In the first year, a number of sites had only monolingual teachers; in the second year, most sites engaged bilingual staff in some capacity. Programs mainly were taught in self-contained classrooms, though some were conducted in special resource rooms or open classrooms, and by team rather than individual teaching.

PHYSICAL PLAN

Physical arrangements for use of BSLC materials also varied from school to school and classroom to classroom. The actual instructional environment was created by each school, with the one requirement being a specified area--individual class, special room, or space within a classroom--in which to conduct the program.

MATERIALS

Materials were used in diverse ways: remedial or non-remedial, incorporated into the regular curriculum or as a supplement. Most sites used the materials as supplementary curricula, though some incorporated BSLC materials into the core curricula during the project's second year of implementation. Materials were used with children from diverse backgrounds and with different needs, among them monolingual Spanish beginners, monolingual English beginners, bilingual Spanish/English children, and some children of Portuguese and Asian background.

PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY

Teachers had considerable freedom in using the materials. Because each program has several levels, teachers used their own discretion in selecting the components most appropriate to the participating pupils. In some cases, they presented the programs so that each pupil could move through them at his/her own pace, resulting in individualized, self-paced instruction. In

others, teachers presented the program(s) to a group of pupils simultaneously. Some classes used the materials with selected pupils, others with the entire class. The programs' flexibility permitted their varied and effective use. The project's versatility, along with the fact that teachers could determine the mode best suited to their teaching approach and to the children in their classes, made it particularly useful in serving a diverse population with special needs. Guidelines for both districts and teachers to use in selecting programs for BSLC are presented in Table 8.

STAFF TRAINING

For ease and effectiveness of implementation, SEDL staff provided information to the districts in both preschool and inservice workshops on practical methods of incorporating the project into the schools. During these sessions they gave guidelines for adoption and implementation and answered questions on various ways in which the project could be used effectively.

Preschool training sessions were held in the summer of 1977, 1978, and 1979; inservice workshops were conducted during the fall and spring of 1977-78 and 1978-79. Sessions were held at locations convenient to schools in each area (i.e., "cluster") and material presented for information and discussion focused on topics of concern to SEDL and local site personnel.

All training sessions were followed by letters and/or phone calls to clarify questions, encourage project support, and maintain open and continuous communication between SEDL and the sites.

PUPIL PROGRESS

Pupil progress was monitored through Pupil Program Information Forms (PPIFs) These forms served as a classroom management tool for teachers, who used them to visualize program scope and sequence and then monitor individual pupils' progress.

In the course of the project, teachers collected PPIF data (summarized in Attachment C) four times--in January and May 1978, and again in January and

TABLE 8

GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING PROGRAMS FOR BSLC

	BOLaR	BCPM	T & R
PERSONNEL	Bilingual (Spanish/English) teacher & bilingual (Spanish/English) aide	Bilingual (Spanish/English) teacher with aide, bilingual if possible	Teacher with instructional aide if possible
INSTRUCTION TIME	Small groups 6 - 8 pupils 10 - 15 minutes per group per day	Approximately 20 minutes per child per day Small groups 4 - 6 pupils per group and individualized instruction	15 minutes per group a week (lesson) (4 - 6 pupils per group) 1 hour 45 min. for each child (game center)/week Small groups 4 - 8 pupils per group and individualized instruction
SPACE	Area in classroom or BSLC for listening/reading oral language	Storage space for instructional materials, games, and supplies	Small lesson activity area for 4 - 6 pupils. Larger space for children to work with games in game area.
	An overall area set aside for the BSLC: an individual classroom, a special room or area in the school, or space within a classroom.		
EQUIPMENT	Large pocket chart (stand or wall hanging) Cassette recorder 2 listening bars Headphones (7 - 10) Overhead projector (optional) and screen (optional) Storage space Full size mirror; large enough for children to see themselves, for oral language instruction	Filmstrip projector and screen 6 cassette tape playback units (type that cannot record & erase) 2 listening bars (group listening centers) each with minimum of 5 outlets 11 headphones (10 for children, 1 for teacher) Visual dividers (optional) Several extension cords	Filmstrip projector and screen Cassette or reel to reel tape player 16mm film projector or videotape playback unit Other classroom equipment usually found in a classroom such as a bulletin board and clock.
MATERIALS	Large chart writing tablets Marks-a-lot pens Sentence strips Clear acetate sheets Audio-visual pens or wax pencils (for writing on the acetate) Cassette tape	Colored cubes Crayons Small rocks Paste Yarn Scissors Straws Toy clocks Yardstick Colored shapes Beans Playing cards Number blocks Cover cards Play money Rubber bands Rulers Buttons Measuring rods (colored tagboard) Number line strips	Small rugs or tables Bookshelves or shelving materials Art supplies such as clay, felt and paint brushes. Miscellaneous supplies such as scissors and rubber bands. Outdoor supplies such as sand and rocks.
TRAINING	3 days preservice for teachers with follow up inservice	1 1/2 days preservice for teachers with follow up inservice	1 1/2 days preservice for teachers with follow up inservice
STUDENTS	120 Spanish-language dominant requiring initial bilingual instruction or subsequent remediation	120 Spanish-language dominant requiring initial bilingual instruction or subsequent remediation	120 Spanish-language-dominant

May 1979. The forms for BCPM and T&R sought information on dates that pupils completed various program components, in this way yielding information about the rate and percent of pupils who progressed through the materials. The BOLaR system originally sought data about both completion and content mastery, but due to the inaccuracy of content mastery data, that element was dropped from the forms in the later collections. The forms were effective in enabling teachers to track individual pupils as they progressed through each content area within a level or to track the class as an aggregate.

Forms also were used to provide a rough estimate of changes over time, specifically the five-month span between the January and May collections each year. There were positive changes each year, both in total number of pupils involved in the program and in increased percentages of pupils completing the levels within each program. Actual percentages varied considerably from one district to another, but the fact that they increased over the time period suggested pupil progress.

In 1977-78 only a small percentage of the pupils completed 50 percent of the components within each BSLC program. In 1978-79, however, a larger percentage of children completed more of the material components.

SPECIAL ASPECTS OF PROJECT

Clusters:

The concept of clustering was proposed to meet the need for delivery of services to project participants in the form of technical assistance and training. As initially described in the original proposal (p. I-25), the concept was envisioned as a unique and responsive solution to the problem of providing on-site services to a large number of primarily rural and widely spaced school districts within those states to be served by the BSLC Project. As the scope of the project as originally proposed was revised downward, the number of projected clusters was decreased, which resulted in increasing the geographic region covered by each cluster.

As it became apparent during first and second waves of orientation meetings that it would be difficult to obtain school districts in sufficient geographic density to warrant smaller, relatively less widespread clusters, the size of clusters was increased, with total number of project clusters being proportionately decreased. Across implementation years 1977-78 and 1978-79, the total number of clusters in the five states varied from 7 to 11, depending upon training session strategies and goals, as well as time of training (i.e., orientation vs. preschool vs. inservice).

This cluster concept introduced some difficulties into the BSLC Project, primarily because of the widespread nature of the districts within each cluster, increasing travel time from the projected maximum of two hours to several hours for some personnel. This increased expense to the districts, both in costs and time, so that numbers of personnel who could be sent to training was limited. Thus many persons involved in implementing BSLC were unable to attend training, and often districts did not send the most appropriate personnel, or persons in adequate numbers, to fully carry on training for implementation on the local level. Thus the implementation of BSLC was weakened by this extraneous burden of travel and per diem costs (which districts could not easily cover) and time required for travel.

The clusters rendered the tasks of providing feedback and assisting schools with problem areas difficult, since the varied needs and problems presented by the widespread areas made handling these in training less than satisfactory. The distances between training and implementation sites prohibited on-site input into needs, thus making SEDL staff feedback less directly applicable to the site than desired. The clusters did provide participants with opportunities to share ideas, hear how others adapted the programs to their needs, and gain a feeling of belonging to a project--all of which served to motivate districts to continue. This effect would probably have been further

enhanced were the districts to be more closely spaced, and able to interact more frequently.

PPIF's:

As documented by information contained in the first three quarterly reports for project implementation year 1976-77, as well as that year's Annual Report, the PPIF system of recording individual student progress through the various program materials has been viewed from different perspectives by different BSLC Project participants. As originally conceived, the PPIF was proposed as a method of ensuring and maintaining materials usage by local school district staff. Its purpose was later broadened to include a role in CSE's evaluation plan of tying student rate of progress through the program materials to measures of student performance, either criterion- or norm-referenced.

SEDL/BSLC staff attempted to encourage district level use of the PPIF system through preschool and inservice briefings, numerous telephone conversations, and summary presentations of SEDL-generated PPIF analyses. Data were received and processed at SEDL, and were then forwarded in summary form to CSE for use in their evaluation activities.

To summarize the experience with the PPIF s, many teachers found them difficult to complete correctly, requiring several rounds of sending in forms before they were able to match requirements. Even though teachers were trained in how to complete these forms in preschool sessions, provided letters of instruction on completing them, and large amounts of time at each inservice session to deal with questions, the difficulties remained. PPIFs required so much time in phone calls, writing, and training as to sometimes become the focus of interaction rather than the more central aspects of implementing the project.

Because of the design of the Forms, teachers often stated they did not feel completing PPIFs helped them see how children were progressing, making

this more of a paperwork requirement than a tool for the teachers. The return rate was lower than desirable partly due to these problems as well as from the burden experienced by teachers resulting from the time required to complete the forms. Some districts requested special permission not to complete PPIFs because they would not place the burden for this much paperwork on the teachers for the small benefit they perceived they received from the Forms.

The PPIFs did provide some basic information about which teachers were using the programs, the numbers of children involved, and the lessons completed; however, much of the other information collected did not seem to be retrievable in a useful form. This was especially true when BSLC was implemented as a supplementary rather than a core curriculum. In these cases, it was impossible to tell from the PPIFs why components were not used--whether it was because the children had the skills, or the teacher lacked knowledge or interest in using the materials, or did not have access to them. It was felt a simpler monitoring tool could have served more useful purposes both to SEDL and BSLC participants.

Hotline:

The Hotline was a toll-free incoming WATS telephone service which was implemented at the beginning of the project to allow districts to contact SEDL with questions and concerns at no local expense. It included two national lines and one Texas line. SEDL staff found the Hotline was used for an average of 60 calls per month during the summer months and 100 calls per month during the school year. All of these calls reflected valid concerns and needs for information.

This phone system was found to be a useful innovation in that it allowed immediate input and feedback to districts at no local expense. The Hotline allowed rapid responses to the individual needs of each participating locality. This cost-efficient mechanism afforded a level of interaction and communication not otherwise likely among personnel unfamiliar with each other. During the fall of 1977, SEDL added a Code-a-phone to this system to answer calls that

came in during hours when the office was not open but when schools were, due to the time differential among states. This improved the consistency of interaction between SEDL and the sites and diminished the effects of distance.

Coordination among Training, Reporting and Testing Activities:

Information that was gathered over the contract period regarding training, reporting and testing activities is reported in Attachment E. Those forms summarize the numbers by roles of persons trained by SEDL within each district, the numbers of persons that submitted reports (PPIF's, CSE Survey Forms, District Information Forms) and conducted CSE testing, both designated by whether or not these persons were trained by SEDL. The following summarizes these data by states involved in the SEDL/BSLC Project:

TABLE 9

Numbers of BSLC Participants Attending SEDL Training, Submitting Reports and Conducting CSE Testing

State	#'s Attending Training			#'s Reporting		#'s Conducting Testing	
	Teachers	Principals	Coords.	Trnd.*	Not Trnd.*	Trnd.*	Not Trnd.*
AZ	161	3	6	60	89	7	5
CA	131	2	13	73	104	21	25
CO	82	4	6	41	134	29	30
NM	101	3	5	68	81	8	10
TX	141	2	8	51	156	8	16
TOTALS	616	14	38	293	564	73	86
Percentages	92%	2%	6%	34%	66%	46%	54%

*Trnd = Trained by SEDL Not Trnd. = Not trained by SEDL

The above Table shows that 616 teachers, 14 principals, and 38 coordinators were trained for a total of 668 in all five states. This information also reveals that of those persons who submitted reports only 293 of the total 857 reporting

persons were trained by SEDL; that is, 34 percent of those reporting in one form or another were trained and 66 percent were not. Since only one third of those reporting on these forms benefited from training and were informed in the implementation of the BSLC programs, it would seem that no results or conclusions from the PPIFs could be reliably drawn.

The above information regarding those persons involved in conducting CSE Testing reveals that over half of the 159 persons involved in testing (this includes first round only data since SEDL was not able to gain access to names of persons involved in second round of testing) did not receive training by SEDL. Thus, testing was in the majority of cases conducted by teachers untrained in the SEDL/BSLC Project, and possibly by persons not involved in any aspect of implementing the BSLC in their classrooms. It is felt that such testing, designed to serve as a measure of project effectiveness, can be viewed only as minimally reliable or accurate when conducted by untrained persons not fully participating in the implementation of the very project being assessed.

STAFF EXPERIENCES AND IMPRESSIONS

In working with the BSLC sites over a three-year period, SEDL staff members noted several problems that appeared to influence the success of the project; some of these were remedied or mitigated by the staff over time, however others were such that the project staff had little or no effect on them or control over them.

In the more rural sites there was a great deal of turnover among staff, administration, teachers, and students. This affected program continuity and led to the need for repeated preschool and/or inservice training sessions at the basic or entry level with little possibliity of moving to higher levels of program understanding and implementation.

. Many teachers were slow to adopt a bilingual program, primarily because they had not had previous experience in this area.

. The learning center concept was new to most classroom teachers, and many found it difficult to work in this type of program.

. Many teachers felt isolated in teaching a bilingual program and missed the peer approval and acceptance they had had when teaching more traditional programs.

. The idea of having a district BSLC coordinator (different from the building principal) was not as effective in practice as it seemed in theory. It was found more effective to have the school principal or someone else in a perceived authority position to serve in this role.

. Materials allocations and distribution were more effective on a basis of two teachers rather than with four teachers.

. Formal criteria for identifying children for participation in the project would be useful.

. Despite the large numbers of telephone calls and letters, communication between SEDL and the sites should be strengthened because intra-site communication was not as strong as it should have been.

. Children should not be moved out of the BSLC project as soon as they reach a predetermined level of success, especially not at the primer level. When they were, the evidence suggests they reverted back toward their "pretreatment" levels of performance.

. The district personnel were always positive and cooperative with the SEDL/BSLC staff.

. During the third year, children completed more areas of instruction than in the second year. The more familiar the teachers were with the program the more the programs were used.

. Both the teachers and the administration had trouble correlating the BSLC Project with the district's adopted basal reader.

. In evaluating a bilingual program, it makes sense to have bilingual evaluators. This was apparent when a bilingual evaluator was added.

. In projects having an external, third-party evaluator, it would be beneficial to all involved if periodic (at least, quarterly) communication regarding evaluation matters were required. In some cases during the BSLC project, interaction among SEDL, Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL), and CSE might have been made more mutually profitable if communications had been scheduled on a periodic and predictable basis rather than as they were.

. For the purposes of project coordination with the external, third-party evaluator as well as internal project monitoring and documentation, it appears that a relatively greater emphasis might have been placed on a staff-internal evaluation design and personnel to implement it.

. In summary, over the course of three years SEDL staff found that, although the BSLC Project on the whole was a positive experience and a successful program, it encountered some unexpected difficulties. Primary among these were the turnover of both staff and pupils in rural areas, the teachers' almost total lack of familiarity with bilingual programs and with the learning center concept, and the need for almost constant communication with the sites to provide both information and support. While these problems were not insurmountable, they tended to delay the individual programs' effectiveness and dull some of the initial enthusiasm of the school districts. These problems, however, were not apparent to the target audience--the children--who seemed to enjoy and benefit from this approach to basic skills.

CONCLUSIONS

The SEDL/BSLC Project was unusual in that it was designed for a rural, primarily bilingual population not often reached by special programs, and it provided

ongoing training and technical assistance support and program materials to school districts to enable them to effectively implement the curricula.

In the project's first year, several unexpected problems were encountered. A primary problem developed in that not everyone wanted to participate in a project that was "free." Initial rejection by a number of school districts on the basis of having too many programs already or not believing that there really would be no costs or federal control delayed the start of the project. Persuasion, along with honest presentation, ultimately led to the project's acceptance.

The second and third years of the project were devoted to providing the sites with the program materials, staff development, and encouragement essential to the project's effectiveness. Frequent letters and phone calls from SEDL to the sites supplied encouragement as well as information, providing teachers with the support they needed as well as the specific help they requested. A number of small problems were ironed out during training visits to the sites; because of the relative isolation of many of the districts, other problems were resolved via phone and letter.

Pupil Program Information Forms revealed that the students, on the average, completed an increasing number of program levels as the project progressed. Requests for materials for the 1979-80 school year which will continue after the completion of the project, indicated teacher and school administration satisfaction with the project.

SECTION III

SEDL/LOUISIANA BSLC COMPONENT
SUMMARY REPORT
1976-1979

The SEDL/BSLC Project in Louisiana differed considerably from the project's implementation in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas. Because of the difference in target audience and program offered, it is reviewed here separately.

Target Audience:

The white and black children served were economically disadvantaged, considerably below "grade level" in mathematics achievement, and selected by teachers on the basis of tests as well as teacher judgment of needs. The participating children in one Parish, for example, all ranked below the 35th percentile in their classes. Other Parishes showed similar test scores.

Program:

The program materials used were the Adston Mathematics Skills Series. This is a program that enables teachers to assess pupils' readiness levels and abilities with whole numbers, fractions, and decimals, and provides prescriptive materials for grades 1 through 6 in mastering fundamental skills in mathmatics.

Project Sites:

Six Parishes (similar to counties in other states) participated in the project. The Parishes and the number of schools that participated in the project during the two years of project implementation are indicated below:

Parish	No. of Schools 1977-78	1978-79
Ascension	7	5
Evangeline	11	12
Pointe Coupee	3	6
St. James	8	8
St. Landry	9	4
W. Baton Rouge	3	3

Two Parishes specified a reason for involving fewer schools in the project the second year. At Ascension Parish, grade assignments to the schools were partly responsible, while in St. Landry Parish, supervisors decided to concentrate their efforts in fewer schools to get better use of the materials and allow for better selection and exchange of available materials.

Program Implementation:

Each Parish established BSLC in a way best suited to their organizational system.

. Ascension Parish - teachers grouped children for BSLC activities, using aides for individual assistance. Most classes were self-contained; one school used departmentalized instruction in the upper grades.

. Evangeline Parish - teachers used individual approaches in self-contained classes, varying the number of days per week devoted to BSLC activity. In 1977-78 and 1978-79 the Parish set up a "3-R school" as a demonstration project on how to teach fundamental skills to children in grades 1 and 2, using the mathematics materials with eligible children. All teachers in the system observed and discussed teaching methodology, and the demand for the mathematics materials exceeded expectations and supplies.

. Pointe Coupee Parish - teachers used individual approaches in self-contained classrooms; one school used departmentalized instruction in upper elementary grades. There were no teaching aides, but there was a special project both years under ESEA funding.

. St. James Parish - approach varied from self-contained classrooms to departmentalized upper grades. Most had teacher aides. A teacher coordinator was used for the first time in 1977-78.

. St. Landry Parish - approach varied from self-contained classes to departmentalized upper grades, and from a continuous progress school to the traditional grade levels.

. West Baton Rouge Parish - with the exception of 10 special education students using readiness materials, all pupils were fifth graders taught in a departmental set-up and grouped for BSLC instruction.

Materials:

1978-79 Use of materials as reported by parishes, follows:

Ascension Parish		
Readiness For Operations	4 schools,	100 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	4 schools,	105 students
Subtraction	4 " ,	135 "
Multiplication	2 " ,	59 "
Division	1 " ,	30 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 " ,	19 "
Re-writing	1 " ,	19 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	19 "
Division	1 " ,	19 "
Evangeline Parish		
Readiness For Operations	5 schools,	406 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	7 schools,	402 students
Subtraction	6 " ,	483 "
Multiplication	5 " ,	260 "
Division	5 " ,	164 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	10 students
Pointe Coupee Parish		
Readiness For Operations	1 school,	9 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	6 schools,	250 students
Subtraction	6 " ,	268 "
Multiplication	6 " ,	242 "
Division	5 " ,	129 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	9 students
Re-writing	1 " ,	8 "
Addition	1 " ,	9 "
Subtraction	1 " ,	9 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	9 "

St. James Parish		
Readiness For Operations	7 schools,	227 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	7 schools,	317 students
Subtraction	7 " ,	245 "
Multiplication	7 " ,	251 "
Division	7 " ,	141
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	19 students
Re-writing	1 " ,	19 "
Addition	1 " ,	19 "
St. Landry Parish		
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	3 schools,	156 students
Subtraction	3 " ,	233 "
Multiplication	3 schools,	171 students
Division	3 " ,	65 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	3 schools,	75 students
Re-writing	3 " ,	65 "
Addition	1 " ,	28 "
Subtraction	1 " ,	28 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	28 "
Division	1 " ,	28 "
Decimal Numbers		
Concepts	1 school,	23 students
Subtraction	1 " ,	23 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	23 "
West Baton Rouge Parish		
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	3 schools,	113 students
Subtraction	3 " ,	112 "
Multiplication	2 " ,	81 "
Division	2 " ,	81 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	1 student

From the above tabulation reported as of February 1, 1979, there was evidence that the students needed to work in lower level basic skills. This confirmed the wisdom of the selection of sets of Readiness and Whole Number Operations in favor of the more difficult sets of materials. Student problems were further reflected in noting that more were involved in the simpler concepts within each set of materials (addition and subtraction) than with more difficult ones (multiplication and division).

An overall status report of the Louisiana Component of the BSLC Project is included in Attachment A.

ATTACHMENT A

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

July 5, 1979

CERTIFIED
RETURNED RECEIPT REQUESTED

Ms. Devra Bloom, Project Manager
Office of Program Development
Community Services Administration
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20506

RE: Contract No. B6B-5525

Dear Devra:

As you requested during our July 3, 1979 telephone conversation, I have enclosed the additional budget information you requested concerning the revised budget sent to you and Rosie Babel in Dr. Perry's June 29, 1979 letter.

If you have questions concerning any of the enclosed, please inform me as soon as possible. In the meantime we are continuing to take the necessary actions to move forward on the disbursement of program materials and the August/September preschool workshops.

Sincerely,

Preston C. Kronkosky

Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

PCK/jp

Enclosures (2)

cc: Dr. James H. Perry
Mr. Arnold W. Kriegel
Ms. Rebeca R. Zuniga

SEDL

Page 34 removed

INFORMATION CONCERNING CONSULTANT FEES FOR CARLOS RODRIGUEZ & SUZANNE RODRIGUEZ

At the time of Carlos Rodriguez' voluntary termination (March 29, 1979--see pages 1 and 2 of the Quarterly Report for the Period January 1, 1979 - March 31, 1979) his annual salary was $19,572 and his employee benefits were $4,697 for a total of $24,269/year. This translates into a daily rate of $93.36 for salary and benefits. Since a "consultant" is not entitled to any Laboratory benefits, it seems reasonable to pay him $100/day for each day that he does work.

At the time of Suzanne Rodriguez' voluntary termination (May 29, 1979--to be reported in the Quarterly Report for the Period April 1, 1979 - June 30, 1979) her annual salary was $19,572 and her employee benefits were $4,697 for a total of $24,269/year. This translates into a daily rate of $93.36 for salary and benefits. Since a "consultant" is not entitled to any Laboratory benefits, it seems reasonable to pay her $100/day for each day that she does work.

If we were to re-employ Suzanne and Carlos on a temporary basis or as provided for in Laboratory policies, we would have to budget the $93.36/day for each of them through June 30, 1979. Beginning July 1, 1979 the Board of Directors has granted a general across-the-board 5% cost of living increase which would change Suzanne's and Carlos' annual salary to $20,556 plus $4,933 in benefits for a total of $25,489. This translates into a daily rate of $98.00 for salary and benefits. Therefore it seems reasonable to pay them on a consultant basis of $100/day worked especially since they are not entitled to any Laboratory benefits -- including sick leave.

In either case, whether we employ Suzanne and Carlos as consultants or as temporary employees there is no doubt in my mind that based on their training and specific experience they are the best qualified persons to perform the duties that we have outlined in relation to the August/September 1979 preschool workshops. We could not find anyone of their ability and experience for less than $100/day--and certainly not in the time frame we have to work with.

Enclosure No. 2 to Dr. Kronkosky's 7/5/79 letter to Ms. Devra Bloom
Page 1 of 2 pages

INFORMATION CONCERNING COMMUNICATIONS COSTS

Communications costs consist of:

-Hotline (i.e., in-coming metered WATS lines, Texas and other states for no cost use by BSLC Project sites);

-Regular WATS (i.e., out-going WATS lines, Texas and other states for metered use by BSLC Project staff);

-Instrument charges (i.e., charges to have an instrument on the desk of each BSLC Project staff member);

-Credit card charges (for use by BSLC Project staff when they are in travel status to contact sites/persons--in lieu of use of WATS);

-Postage (usual postage for mailing large volume of letters to BSLC Project sites, plus CSSO's, CSE, CSA, etc.); and

-Shipping (cost of transporting free curriculum materials to BSLC Project sites).

The manner in which we arrived at the $1,200/month estimate is detailed below:

Basic Skills Communications:	1977	1978	Total ÷ 6 mos.	Average/Mo.
Hotline				
July	$575.00	$536.00		
August	$575.00	$525.00	$3,899.00	$650.00
September	$1057.00	$631.00		
Regular WATS				
July	$104.00	$134.00		
August	$223.00	$147.00	$1,023.00	$171.00
September	$197.00	$218.00		
Instrument				
July	$168.00	$194.00		
August	$171.00	$226.00	$1,198.00	$200.00
September	$167.00	$272.00		
Credit Cards				
July	$143.00	-		
August	-	$8.00	$254.00	$42.00
September	$69.00	$34.00		
Postage				
July	$64.00	$75.00		
August	$66.00	$192.00	$722.00	$121.00
September	$239.00	$86.00		
				* $1,184.00

*Additional cost of transporting (usually by air freight) training materials used by BSLC staff to sites in August/September 1979 should bring Average Month close to $1,200.00.

41

Our best estimates of Hotline (i.e., in-coming WATS) use is as follows:

1978 -- July/August/September

Approximately 60 calls per month concerning:
1) Preschool Workshops
2) Material Requests
3) Questions on the May 1978 PPIF Computer Printouts

1979 -- April/May/June

Approximately 100 calls per month concerning:
1) Inservice Workshops
2) Questions concerning the May 1979 PPIF deadline
3) 1979-80 Material Requests

The publishing company, National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc. (NELP) advises us to budget an amount for shipping approximately equal to 5% of the total cost of the materials. Since the materials are budgeted for $172,890.00, 5% of that is $8,645. However, since we are billed for actual shipping costs after the shipment is completed, we decided that in view of the recent truck strike and rising shipping rates we should round the $8,645 estimate to $9,000.00.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

7/6/79
Noted
PCK

July 6, 1979

Mr. Frank Capell
Center for Study of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall
UCLA Graduate School of Education
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dear Mr. Capell:

Based upon my recent conversation with Ms. Bonnie Sissons of your office, I indicated that a June 29, 1979 deadline for processing of the pupil program information forms (PPIF) could not be met. It was determined that unless I heard otherwise that July 15, 1979 would be an acceptable delivery date for the PPIF's for BOLaR and BCPM.

In addition, it is my present understanding that the 9 track computer tape furnished to you last year is not required for this year.

If you have any additional questions, please contact me.

Yours very truly,

Arnold W. Kriegel

Arnold W. Kriegel
Director, Fiscal & Technical Services

AWK/lb

cc: Dr. Preston Kronkosky
Marsha Meador

SEDL

Community Services Administration WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

JUL 11 1979

7/19/79
Noted
PCK
Barbara-
Please
make
a copy
for
Arnold.
Thanks
PCK

Mr. Preston Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Preston:

This is to advise you that Ms. Lynn Morris has resigned her position and is no longer co-director of the BSLC Evaluation.

Ms. Bonnie Sisson of the BSLC staff will assume the co-directorship and associated duties.

If you have any inquiries on the evaluation, please contact Frank Cappell or Bonnie Sisson.

Sincerely,

Devra Bloom

Devra Bloom
Program Manager

cc: Adrianne Banks, Associate Dir.
Ricardo Martinez
Bonnie Sisson

RECEIVED
JUL 19 1979

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

July 11, 1979

Mr. Frank Capell, Co-Director
Center for Study of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall
UCLA Graduate School of Education
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dear Mr. Capell:

Enclosed you will find the BOLaR computer printouts containing the May 1979 information from the PPIFs. Because they are being sent by Federal Express they will arrive on July 12 or 13 not July 15, as stated in Arnold Kriegel's letter of July 6, 1979. These printouts are now complete since you have already received the BCPM printouts that were sent on June 25, 1979.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call us.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Pscheid

Jane M. Pscheid, Secretary
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

/jp

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky
Ms. Becky Zuniga
Mr. Arnold Kriegel

BSDL

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

Sent Capfield

July 16, 1979

Mr. Frank Capell, Co-Director
CSE-BSLC Evaluation
Center for Study of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall
UCLA Graduate School of Education
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dear Mr. Capell:

Enclosed are the T&R computer printouts with the information from the May 1979 Pupil Program Information Forms. If you have any questions, please call us.

Sincerely,

Jane M. Pscheid

Jane M. Pscheid, Secretary
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

/jp

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky
Ms. Rebeca R. Zuniga

Texas Education Agency

• STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
• STATE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
• STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas
78701

July 17, 1979

7/18/79
Noted
PCK

Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Center Project
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Dr. Kronkosky:

Thank you for your letter informing me about the end of the project, Basic Skills Learning Centers Project.

I was very impressed with the materials and the manner in which they were presented by the consultants from the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

I am sure the training and materials have been very helpful to teachers and have assisted children in learning.

Thank you for the information you have provided me during the past two years and the opportunity to participate in one of the training phases.

Sincerely,

M. Irene Ramirez

M. Irene Ramirez, Ed.D.
Consultant, Elementary Education Section
Division of Curriculum Development

MIR/aw

"An Equal Opportunity Employer"

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

July 20, 1979

Ms. Devra Bloom, Project Manager
Office of Program Development
Community Services Administration
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dear Devra:

Thank you for your July 11, 1979 letter approving the June 29, 1979 budget. We are proceeding with the necessary actions to distribute the program materials and conduct the August/September 1979 preschool workshops.

Sincerely,

Preston C. Kronkosky

Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

PCK/jp

cc: Dr. James H. Perry, SEDL
Mr. Arnold Kriegel, SEDL
Ms. Rebeca Zuniga, SEDL/BSLC
Ms. Rosie Babel, CSA Contracts

SEDL

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

July 20, 1979

Sample letter sent to all
BSLC Superintendents

Mr. O. John Taylor, Superintendent
Fowler School District
658 East Adams Avenue
Fowler, CA 93625

Dear Mr. Taylor:

For the past two years the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's (SEDL) Basic Skills Learning Centers Project (BSLC), funded by the Community Services Administration (CSA), has been assisting your district in the basic skills and bilingual efforts. This assistance was provided through instructional materials and staff training/technical assistance at no cost to your district. As we come to the end of the Project (September 30, 1979) we will provide your district the final additional materials that were requested by your district's BSLC Coordinator. Also we will provide a final, preschool workshop for new teachers, assistant teachers and/or resource personnel (see enclosed training schedule).

In a few weeks you should be receiving the total year (1978-79) computer printout reports that will provide you with the number of children involved in the program(s), the teachers involved and the percentage of completion in each area of every program. All the above information will be sent to your district's BSLC Coordinator.

As we look at these two years, we believe that the SEDL Basic Skills Learning Centers Project has been successful and worthwhile. The children that have been involved in the project have made solid gains in reading and mathematics according to the information furnished by teachers and/or principals. Also the teachers have expressed a great deal of satisfaction. We believe that much of the success which has been experienced is due to your leadership and support.

In closing, we would like to thank you and your staff for all your cooperation during these past two years. Even though this particular project is ending, we at SEDL hope that in the near future we will again have the opportunity to be of assistance to your district.

If you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance, please call us on our toll-free number (1/800/531-5011); after September 30, 1979 you can reach us at (512)476-6861.

Sincerely,

Preston C. Kronkosky

Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

PCK/jp

Enclosure:

cc: Ms. Rebeca Zuniga, SEDL/BSLC
Ms. Devra Bloom, CSA

BSLC PRESCHOOL WORKSHOPS

AUGUST/SEPTEMBER, 1979

August 7-9, 1979
Fort Lupton School District
Ft. Lupton, Colorado

August 14-16, 1979
Pecos School District
Pecos, New Mexico

August 21-23, 1979
Glendale School District
Glendale, Arizona

August 28-29, 1979
Gadsden School District
Anthony, New Mexico

September 5-7, 1979
Mission ISD
Mission, Texas

September 12-14, 1979
Porterville School District
Porterville, California

September 17-19, 1979
Brawley School District
Brawley, California

September 24-25, 1979
Levelland School District
Levelland, Texas

September 26-27, 1979
Hondo ISD
Hondo, Texas

Texas Education Agency

- STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
- STATE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
- STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas
78701

July 25, 1979

7/27/79
Noted
PCK

Mr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Mr. Kronkosky:

We have received your letter of July 13 to Dr. Brockette with regard to the SEDL Basic Skills Learning Centers Project for the years 1977 through 1979.

Thank you for writing giving in detail information on this project, and we sincerely appreciate the fine cooperation provided by you and your staff in the promotion of same. Please know that we, at the Agency, also will look forward to further opportunity to work with you.

Sincerely,

L. Harlan Ford

L. Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner
for Programs and Personnel Development

cc: Dorothy Davidson

"An Equal Opportunity Employer"

memorandum

SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, 211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

To: District Coordinator

From: Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

Date: July 26, 1979

Subject: Total Year Computer Printout Reports (1978-79)

The teachers that participated in the Basic Skills Learning Centers Project during the 1978-79 school year took a lot of their time and effort in recording the information needed on the Pupil Program Information Forms (PPIF). The information that was provided is summarized on the enclosed computer printouts.

The time and effort that the teachers put into completing the forms can be useful when the summaries are given to the appropriate person. Please distribute and explain the folders containing the classroom and school summaries to the principal. The superintendent would be interested in receiving the classroom, school and district summaries.

Since the Project is ending September 30, 1979 these will be the final printouts you will receive from us. We want to thank you for all your assistance in reminding and encouraging the teachers to provide the information needed on the PPIF's.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call us.

Rebeca R. Zuniga

Rebeca R. Zuniga, Coordinator
Instructional Services and Training
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

BZ/jp

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director-BSLC Project

FRED M. Smith
President
ERIC THURSTON
Vice President
LIONEL PELLEGRIN
Secretary
SAM ADAMS
Treasurer

ADSTON EDUCATIONAL ENTERPRISES, INC.
945 EAST RIVER OAKS DRIVE
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70815
PHONE (504) 925-2848

July 30, 1979

Dr. Preston Kronkosky
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

Dear Preston:

As you requested, this is a status report for 1978-79 on the Louisiana Component, BSLC Program, funded by CSA.

Procedures used this year were the same as those of 1977-78, with the exception that there was less teacher training requested by the participating systems, as the same teachers were expected to be in the program. Changes in distribution among schools within systems were made in light of the first year's experiences. Thus, as will be noted later, the identical number of schools in each parish system may/may not have been the case for both years, although the number of sets of all materials for each system was the same. A noticeable difference appeared in the selection of the sets of materials, with much heavier emphasis in 1978-79 on Readiness For Operations and Working With Whole Numbers, and fewer numbers of the more difficult sets of Common Fractions and Decimal Numbers.

I visited each system to discuss selection and ordering of materials and reporting forms (or anything else related to the program) last August, and followed through in September with delivery of all materials. You joined me in visiting St. James and St. Landry Parishes to discuss program development and reports in mid-October.

Each system was visited in early May after I received the computer reports on results of the first semester (as reported prior to February 1). Discussions were held with the system representatives concerning points of reporting:

1. System representatives were asked to analyze teacher reports to determine whether individualized or small group center instruction was in evidence, and whether student progress appeared in logical fashion. They were encouraged to do this with school principals in attendance.

2. Attention of system representatives was called to the number of students reported, as compared to the number of sets of material distributed.

3. Possible confusion in reporting by a few teachers was called to their attention.

Usage, as reported by parishes, was as follows:

Ascension Parish		
Readiness For Operations	4 schools,	100 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	4 schools,	105 students
Subtraction	4 " ,	135 "
Multiplication	2 " ,	59 "
Division	1 " ,	30 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 " ,	19 "
Re-writing	1 " ,	19 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	19 "
Division	1 " ,	19 "
Evangeline Parish		
Readiness For Operations	5 schools,	406 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	7 schools,	402 students
Subtraction	6 " ,	483 "
Multiplication	5 " ,	260 "
Division	5 " ,	164 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	10 students
Pointe Coupee Parish		
Readiness For Operations	1 school,	9 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	6 schools,	250 students
Subtraction	6 " ,	268 "
Multiplication	6 " ,	242 "
Division	5 " ,	129 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	9 students
Re-writing	1 " ,	8 "
Addition	1 " ,	9 "
Subtraction	1 " ,	9 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	9 "
St. James Parish		
Readiness For Operations	7 schools,	227 students
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	7 schools,	317 students
Subtraction	7 " ,	245 "
Multiplication	7 " ,	251 "
Division	7 " ,	141
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	19 students
Re-writing	1 " ,	19 "
Addition	1 " ,	19 "
St. Landry Parish		
Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	3 schools,	156 students
Subtraction	3 " ,	233 "

St. Landry Parish (continued)

Multiplication	3 schools,	171 students
Division	3 " ,	65 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	3 schools,	75 students
Re-writing	3 " ,	65 "
Addition	1 " ,	28 "
Subtraction	1 " ,	28 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	28 "
Division	1 " ,	28 "
Decimal Numbers		
Concepts	1 school,	23 students
Subtraction	1 " ,	23 "
Multiplication	1 " ,	23 "

West Baton Rouge Parish

Working With Whole Numbers		
Addition	3 schools,	113 students
Subtraction	3 " ,	112 "
Multiplication	2 " ,	81 "
Division	2 " ,	81 "
Common Fractions		
Concepts	1 school,	1 student

From the above tabulation reported as of February 1, 1979, there is evidence that the students really needed to work in lower level basic skills. This confirms the wisdom of the selection of sets of Readiness and Whole Number Operations in favor of the more difficult sets of materials. Student problems are further reflected in noting that more were involved in the simpler concepts within each set of materials (addition and subtraction versus multiplication and division).

Computer reports on the second semester have not been received as of this date. In a telephone conversation with the director of SEDL's computer services, while work was in progress on the Louisiana component, I was told that it appeared a more thorough job of reporting was done, including more students. A problem of not having seen mid-year reports until very late in the school session is that of not being able to do much about improving the reporting process for the year. However, it is apparent from discussions with systems representatives that actual usage of materials is much more extensive and effective than reports reflect.

It must also be remembered that these materials can follow the student as he/she moves in school, and are useful in assisting through the mastery of basic elementary skills. Thus, if a system so desires, a fourth grade student can use Working With Whole Numbers, Common Fractions, and/or Decimal Numbers through the normal sixth or seventh grades, providing supplementary skills development materials at those levels also.

As indicated in last year's report, Pointe Coupee Parish developed a project under ESEA funding and extended the usage of the Adston Mathematics Skills Series to children not eligible under CSA guidelines. Their results have been exceptional, with student progress carefully monitored.

Evangeline Parish developed a "3-R School", in which teachers from all parish schools at given grade levels visited to work with master teachers

to learn to more effectively develop basic skills. The mathematics program was the most specific of the materials used, and the school system hopes to be able to purchase the materials to continue the program on their own next year.

St. Landry Parish has continued to develop their elementary mathematics curriculum project, begun in 1977-78 and incorporating a scope-and-sequence based on the Adston Series.

All systems could have used more materials. Hopefully there will be less financial pressure next year so that budgets may include money in the teaching materials category to permit the purchase of materials. All involved considered this project an excellent expenditure of CSA funds, and a legitimate means of providing eligible children assistance with learning problems.

As soon as second semester computer reports are received, I will visit with system representatives to review them, and to urge the continued use of materials left over from the project. I feel sure most will do so. Logically, many children in the project in 1977-78 continued to use the materials in 1978-79, but were not reported.

We of Adston appreciate being a part of this project. We have some reflections on improving participation and monitoring processes in order to more nearly maximize the effectiveness of the project.

If I may be of further assistance, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely,

Lionel Pellegrin

Lionel Pellegrin

cde

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State Office Building, 201 E. Colfax
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone (303) 839-2212

Calvin M. Frazier, Commissioner

August 1, 1979

Mr. Preston Kronkosky
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Mr. Preston:

We here at the Colorado Department of Education in the Bilingual Unit regret the loss of the Basic Skills Learning Center services. Your materials including the BOLAR series as well as the inservice training provided to bilingual programs were invaluable. Again and again we heard high praise from directors for your project. You and your staff did an outstanding job in supplying materials, providing practical technical assistance on the use of the materials and keeping a high level of communication between your staff and the participating districts.

Unfortunately the colorado legislature reduced the state appropriation for bilingual education by another 24% and districts are operating at a 50% funding level from state sources. However, 16 school districts that applied for federal monies should know soon if their proposals were approved or not. It is our hope that they will have funds to invest in quality bilingual materials such as yours.

Please let us know what your plans for the future are. Again, thank you for your part in strengthening bilingual programs in Colorado.

Sincerely,

Rosalie Martinez

Rosalie Martinez, Director
Bilingual-Bicultural Unit
839-3557

RM:ga

cc: Dr. Cal Frazier, CDE
Dr. Wm. Dean, CDE
Dr. James Perry SEDL
Ms. Rebecca Zuniga SEDL

AUG 02 1979

c: Jane Bailey
8-6-79

Dr. James H. Perry
Executive Director
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Dr. Perry:

I have reviewed your quarterly report for the period ending June 30, 1979, for Contract # B6B-5525.

In the presentation of the final report, please include the SEDL's total experience with the project and not just the administrative portion. If you have any questions or would like to discuss what should be included, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Devra Bloom
Program Manager

cc: Rosie Babel/CSA Contracting Officer
Ricardo Martinez/NIE
Preston Kronkosky/BSLC Program Director

RECEIVED
AUG 06 1979

memorandum

SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, 211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

To: District Coordinator

From: Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

Date: August 8, 1979

Subject: Preschool Training Session Reminder!

During the month of June we informed you of the last BSLC training session before the Project ends on September 30, 1979. Since this is the last session we are hoping for a good turnout, so we have revised the schedule slightly to include all teachers that will be using our programs during the 1979-80 school year. The training schedule is as follows:

DATE:	August 21-22	BSLC staff will hold training for the BOLaR and BCPM programs. This is only recommended for teachers who have not received previous training in either program.
	August 23	BSLC staff will assist all teachers (new and experienced) in setting up a support system.
TIME:	8:30 - 4:00	All three days.
LOCATION:	Glendale School District #40 Glendale Elementary 4801 West Maryland Avenue Glendale, AZ	

Please inform your teachers of this session and keep in mind that the teachers who have had previous training need only to attend the third day. We would appreciate your calling our office on our toll-free number 1/800/531-5011 to let us know the number of attendees. We look forward to seeing you and your teachers.

Rebeca R. Zuniga

Rebeca R. Zuniga, Coordinator
Instructional Services and Training
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

BZ/jp

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, BSLC-Director

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

J. KELLY NIX
State Superintendent

P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, La.
70804

August 13, 1979

Mr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Mr. Kronkosky:

Thank you for your letter informing me of SEDL's Basic Skills Learning Centers Project. I am indeed delighted to know that so many of Louisiana's children in grades 1-6 were involved in the project.

Student improvement in the basic skills has been a priority goal for Louisiana. I feel that we have made steady gains in the last several years in this area, thanks to programs such as yours working cooperatively with the Department of Education.

I, too, hope that in the near future we will have the opportunity to work with your agency in another educational endeavor.

If my office can ever be of assistance, please call upon me.

Sincerely,

J. KELLY NIX

JKN:RG:lhb

RECEIVED
AUG 20 1979

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

Sample of letter sent to BSLC districts requesting 1979-80 materials

August 17, 1979

Mrs. Verna Coffman
Bonita School District #16
Sunset Route, Box 1
Willcox, AZ 85643

Dear Mrs. Coffman:

This letter is to notify you that the Publishing Company has shipped your 1979-80 materials that you requested during our telephone conversation in June. Enclosed you will find a copy of your material order indicating the quantity.

Since the SEDL/BSLC Project will terminate September 30, 1979 you will not need to keep any more records (PPIF's) or do any further testing. If you have any questions concerning the above, please do not hesitate to call us on our toll-free number 1/800/531-5011.

We wish you a successful 1979-80 school year!

Sincerely,

Rebeca R. Zuniga

Rebeca R. Zuniga, Coordinator
Instructional Services and Training
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

RRZ/jp

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director-BSLC Project

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701
512/476-6861

Sample of letter sent to BSLC districts requesting us not to send 1979-80 materials

August 17, 1979

Mrs. Belen Moreno
Avondale School District #44
235 West Western Avenue
Avondale, AZ 85323

Dear Mrs. Moreno:

In response to our June 1979 telephone call, you indicated that your district had sufficient BSLC materials on hand and asked that we not send any 1979-80 materials.

Even though you do not need any additional materials, we wanted you to know that the BSLC staff is here to assist you with any questions or concerns you may have through September 30, 1979 (the date the BSLC Project concludes).

Sincerely,

Rebeca R. Zuniga

Rebeca R. Zuniga, Coordinator
Instructional Services and Training
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

RRZ/jp

cc: Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director-BSLC Project

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

Sample to all Cond.

September 7, 1979

Mr. Ernest Andrade
Weld School District #6 (Greeley)
4th Avenue and 13th Street
Greely, CO 80631

Dear Mr. Andrade:

It seems only like yesterday we contacted you for the first time to notify you of the BSLC Project. Now it is time to let you know that as of September 30, 1979 we are completing the three year contract we have with the Community Services Administration. By September 28th, your district should have received the 1979-80 materials that were ordered as well as the last training session conducted by SEDL/BSLC.

We do want to thank you for your assistance in coordinating the BSLC Project in your district. The degree of success of this project is directly related to the time, effort and energy that you put into this project--in addition to the many other demands imposed upon you. We hope that the gains the pupils have achieved made your efforts worthwhile.

If we can be of any further assistance to you, please call us at 1/800/531-5011 (prior to 5:00 p.m., September 28, 1979), or at 512/476-6861 (after September 28, 1979). We have appreciated the opportunity to work with you and your district's staff to improve schooling for these pupils.

Sincerely,

Preston C. Kronkosky

Preston C. Kronkosky, Director
Basic Skills Learning Centers Project

cc: Ms. Rebeca Zuñiga, BSLC-Coordinator

PCK/sb

SEDL

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 40 OF MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Glendale Elementary Schools

5734 WEST GLENDALE AVENUE, GLENDALE, ARIZONA 85301

(602) 931-9311

BOARD OF TRUSTEES: ROSE ANN ARMIJO, JO ANN SALEM, PATRICK TURNER, BARBARA GARLAND, CARL BAILEY

ADMINISTRATION

HADLEY A. THOMAS
Superintendent

LYLE BRAUGHTON
Assistant Superintendent
Instructional Services

ERNEST W. RICHARDS
Assistant Superintendent
Business Services

ALEJANDRO PEREZ
Administrative Assistant
Special Programs

WILLIAM D. POLHEMUS
Administrative Assistant
Personnel Services

SCHOOLS

Unit I School
7301 North 58th Avenue

Isaac E. Imes School
5625 North 56th Avenue

Harold W. Smith School
5534 North 63rd Avenue

Melvin E. Sine School
5932 West Myrtle Avenue

William C. Jack School
6600 West Missouri Avenue

Unit VI School
6535 North 67th Avenue

Glenn F. Burton School
6801 West Maryland Avenue

Glendale American School
6530 North 55th Avenue

Bicentennial School
6237 West Missouri Avenue

Unit X School
6520 North 47th Avenue

September 18, 1979

Dr. Preston C. Kronkosky, Director-BSLC Project
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Dr. Kronkosky:

On behalf of Glendale Elementary School District, I would like to express our sincere thanks for the excellent assistance which the BSLC extended and delivered to our district. The inservice training afforded to us through BSLC was invaluable.

Carlos, Suzzanne, and Becky were the highlight of our two-week inservice training session in August. The teachers found the training most worthwhile.

Your staff has been most courteous and accommodating at all times. We regret that we will no longer have the services offered by BSLC.

We appreciate all that the project has done.

Sincerely,

D.J. Dodd
Lau Compliance Coordinator

DJD/kl

RECEIVED
SEP 24 1979

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EVALUATION
UCLA GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

September 10, 1979

Dr. Preston Kronkosky
Director, SEDL-BSLC Project
Southwest Educational Development Lab
211 East 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Preston Kronkosky,

Please find enclosed 1 copy of the CSE evaluation of the Basic Skills Learning Centers, submitted to the Community Services Agency, on September 7, 1979. Should you have any comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Sisson

Bonnie Sisson

Frank J Capell

Frank Capell
Co-Project Directors of the BSLC Evaluation

cc: Eva Baker
Adrianne Bank
Devra Bloom

enclosure

ATTACHMENT B

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

ARIZONA

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Avondale #44					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	Does Not Apply				
T&R	Does Not Apply				
Bonita #16					
BOLaR		Grade 1-4		60	2
BCPM	NO INFORMATION				
T&R		Grade 1-4		60	2
Glendale #40					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	No Information				
Globe #1					
BOLaR	NO INFORMATION				
BCPM		Grade 3	Spec.Ed 1-3	100	
T&R	No Information				
Kyrene #28					
BOLaR			Grade 1-3	90	5
BCPM		Grade 1 & 3	Grade 1 & 3	150	8
T&R			Grade 1	28	1
Laveen #59					
BOLaR	Grades 1 & 2		(core) Grade 1	100	4
BCPM		Grade 1	Grade 1	50	3
T&R	Grades 1 & 2			250	8

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

ARIZONA continued

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Naco #23					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3			53	3
BCPM		Grades 1-3		25	3
T&R		Grades 1-3		53	3
Parker #27					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	No Information				
Peoria #11					
BOLaR	Grades 1-4			120	12
BCPM		Grades 1-4		240	12
T&R	Grades 1-3			120	12
Santa Cruz #35					
BOLaR	DOES NOT APPLY				
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	Grades 1-3			110	6
Solomonville #5					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4		104	4
BCPM		Grades 1-4		104	4
T&R		Grades 1-4		104	4
Sunnyside #12					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	No Information				

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

CALIFORNIA

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Biola-Pershing					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3			8	1
BCPM	WILL NOT BE USED				
T&R		Grades 1-3		50	3
Brawley					
BOLaR	Grades 2&3		Grade 1	135	6
BCPM	Grades 1&2	Grades 1 & 3		100	5
T&R	Grades 1-3			220	9
Calexico					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	No Information				
Earlimart					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4		60	5
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
El Centro					
BOLaR	Grades 1-4	Grades 2-4	Grades 1-4	270	9
BCPM	Grades 1-3	Grades 1-3		200	6
T&R			Grades 1-4	90	2
Fowler					
BOLaR	DOES NOT APPLY				
BCPM		Grades 1-3		95	9
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

CALIFORNIA continued

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Gustine					
BOLaR	NO INFORMATION				
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Heber					
BOLaR	Grades 1-2	Grades 1-4	Grades 4-5	300	12
BCPM	NO INFORMATION				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Imperial					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3		Grades 3-4	140	4
BCPM		Grades 1-4		140	4
T&R			Grades 1-4	450	15
Kings River					
BOLaR		Grades 1-2		30	1
BCPM	WILL NOT BE USED				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Le Grand					
BOLaR	Grades 1-4	Grades 1-4		70	5
BCPM	NO INFORMATION				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Madera					
BOLaR	DOES NOT APPLY				
BCPM	Grades 1-4			120	4
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

CALIFORNIA continued

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Mendota					
BOLaR	Does not apply				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	No Information				
Planada					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3	Grade 4	Grades 1-4	100	4
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Selma					
BOLaR		Grades 1-2		100	3
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Porterville					
BOLaR	Grades 1-4			40	4
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Woodville					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4	Grades 2-3	100	6
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

COLORADO

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Brighton 27-J					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	No Information				
Centennial RE-1					
BOLaR		Grade 2		40	2
BCPM		Grade 2		18	1
T&R		Grades 1-4		160	4
Ft. Lupton RE-8					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4		360	12
BCPM			Grades 1-4	180	6
T&R	Grade 1			120	4
Greeley #6					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4		250	13
BCPM		Grades 1-4		250	13
T&R		Grades 1-3		150	8
Harrison #2					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6		832	22
BCPM		Grades 2-3		56	2
T&R	Grades 1-4			112	4
Huerfano RE-1					
BOLaR		Grades 1-3		150	5
BCPM		Grades 2-3		95	3
T&R		Grades 1-3		40	2

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials following Project Termination

COLORADO continued

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Trinidad #1					
BOLaR		Grades 1-3		173	4
BCPM		Grades 1-3		139	3
T&R	NO INFORMATION				
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

NEW MEXICO

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Gadsden					
BOLaR	Grades 1-4	Grades 1-4		1,041	
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	NO INFORMATION				
Lordsburg					
BOLaR	NOT BEING USED				
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	Grade 2			28	1
Pecos					
BOLaR		Grades 1-3		164	7
BCPM	NO INFORMATION				
T&R		Grades 1-3		164	7
Portales					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3			231	10
BCPM	Grades 1-4			150	5
T&R	Grades 1-3			70	3
Raton					
BOLaR	DOES NOT APPLY				
BCPM		Grades 1-3		107	3
T&R		Grades 1-3		107	1
W. Las Vegas					
BOLaR		Grades 1-2		30	2
BCPM	Grades 1-2			30	2
T&R	Grade 1			20	1

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

TEXAS

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Alice					
BOLaR	DOES NOT APPLY				
BCPM		Grades 1-4		300	14
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Eagle Pass					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4		400	36
BCPM		Grades 1-4			
T&R	NO INFORMATION				
Edcouch-Elsa					
BOLaR	Grades 1-3	Grades 1-3	Grades 3-4	768	24
BCPM	Grades 1-3	Grades 1-3	Grades 3-4	768	24
T&R	Grades 1-3	Grades 1-3	Grades 3-4	768	24
Hondo					
BOLaR		Grades 1-3	Grades 1-2	198	9
BCPM	DOES NOT APPLY				
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
La Feria					
BOLaR	Grades 1-2	Grades 1-2	Grades 1-3	160	9
BCPM	Grades 1-2	Grades 1-2	Grades 1-3	160	9
T&R			Grades 1-2	90	3
La Joya					
BOLaR	Grade 3	Grade 3		250	8
BCPM		Grade 3		250	8
T&R		Grades 3-4		180	

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials following Project Termination

TEXAS continued

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Levelland					
BOLaR	Grades 1-2	Grade 3		80	3
BCPM	Grades 1-2	Grade 3		80	3
T&R		Grade 1	Grades 3-4	80	3
Los Fresnos					
BOLaR		Grades 1-3	Grade 1	126	
BCPM		Grades 1-3	Grade 1	126	
T&R	DOES NOT APPLY				
Mission					
BOLaR	Spanish Grades 1-3	English Grades 1-3		480	8
BCPM					
T&R			Grades 1-2	160	2
Progreso					
BOLaR	Grades 1-2	Grades 2-3		245	12
BCPM		Grades 2-3		245	12
T&R		Grades 2-3		245	12
Rio Hondo					
BOLaR	No Information				
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	Does not apply				
San Benito					
BOLaR	Grades 1-2	Grades 3-4	Grades 1-2	195	23
BCPM	No Information				
T&R	Does not apply				

District Plans to Utilize BSLC Materials Following Project Termination

Texas continued

District	Core	Supplement	Resource	Students	Teachers
Zapata					
BOLaR		Grades 1-4		320	10
BCPM			Grades 1-3	80	1
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					
BOLaR					
BCPM					
T&R					

ATTACHMENT C

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

72

DISTRICT		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Annadale	Number of	Schools	ND	ND							ND		
		Classrooms	↓	↓							↓		
		Children											
		Teachers											
	% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %				A %				I %			
		2 %											
		3 %				B %				II %			
		4 %	↓	↓							↓		
Annex	Number of	Schools	1	1	∅		1	1	∅		1	1	∅
		Classrooms	2	2	∅		2	2	∅		2	2	∅
		Children	25	26	+1		26	26	∅		26	26	∅
		Teachers	2	2	∅		2	2	∅		2	2	∅
	% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %	0	8.7	+8.7	A %	0	0	∅	I %	0	0	∅
		2 %	0	2.3	+2.3								
		3 %	0	.6	+.6	B %	0	0	∅	II %	0	0	∅
		4 %	0	0	∅								
Arden	Number of	Schools	1	1	∅		ND	1			ND	1	
		Classrooms	3	3	∅		↓	2			↓	2	
		Children	79	83	+4			58				52	
		Teachers	3	3	∅			2				2	
	% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %	10.9	16.9	+6	A %		13.2		I %		12	
		2 %	4.2	10.8	+6.6								
		3 %	3.6	7.5	+3.9	B %	↓	11.9		II %	↓	12.5	
		4 %	0	2.2	+2.2								
Arlington	Number of	Schools	ND	ND			1	1	∅		1	1	∅
		Classrooms	↓	↓			4	4	∅		4	4	∅
		Children					109	109	∅		110	110	∅
		Teachers					4	4	∅		4	4	∅
	% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %				A %	0	0	∅	I %	6.7	6.7	∅
		2 %											
		3 %				B %	0	0	∅	II %	0	0	∅
		4 %	↓	↓									

DNA

begun T&R March 1979

DNA = Does Not Apply ∅ = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

92

DISTRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
	Number of		Schools	ND	1			1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-
			Classrooms		1			2	5	+3		1	1	-0-
			Children		38			57	146	+89		4	5	+1
			Teachers		3			1	2	+1		1	1	-0-
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %			8.4		A %	29.1	31.1	+2	I %	25	85	+60
		LEVEL 2 %			4.7									
		LEVEL 3 %			8.4		B %	.9	13.9	+13	II %	0	0	-0-
		LEVEL 4 %			.8									
	Number of		Schools	2	2	-0-		2	2	-0-		2	2	-0-
			Classrooms	6	6	-0-		3	5	+2		9	11	+2
			Children	114	140	+26		62	93	+31		219	270	+51
			Teachers	5	5	-0-		3	4	+1		8	9	+1
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		18.2	28.8	+10.6	A %	15.7	27.8	+12.1	I %	8.7	37.2	+28.5
		LEVEL 2 %		2.5	13.2	+10.7								
		LEVEL 3 %		0	6.2	+6.2	B %	0	2.3	+2.3	II %	3.5	37.5	+34
		LEVEL 4 %		0	0	-0-								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-
			Classrooms	2	2	-0-		4	4	-0-		4	4	-0-
			Children	54	54	-0-		93	96	+3		91	91	-0-
			Teachers	2	2	-0-		1	1	-0-		4	4	-0-
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		29.8	29.8	-0-	A %	4.7	8.1	+3.4	I %	0	0	-0-
		LEVEL 2 %		24.5	35.7	+11.2								
		LEVEL 3 %		12	51.3	+39.3	B %	13	19.5	+6.5	II %	0	14.2	+14.2
		LEVEL 4 %		13.2	30.8	+17.6								
	Number of		Schools	ND	ND			ND	ND			ND	ND	
			Classrooms											
			Children											
			Teachers											
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %					A %				I %			
		LEVEL 2 %												
		LEVEL 3 %					B %				II %			
		LEVEL 4 %												

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

72

DISTRICT		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of		Schools	3	3	Ø		2	2	Ø		1	1	Ø
		Classrooms	9	9	Ø		4	4	Ø		2	2	Ø
		Children	221	227	+6		129	141	+12		64	75	+11
		Teachers	5	5	Ø		3	3	Ø		2	2	Ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		9	12	+3	A %	13.2	22.6	+9.4	I %	29	86	+57
	LEVEL 2 %		4.3	7.2	+2.9								
	LEVEL 3 %		2.2	3.6	+1.4	B %	5.4	16.3	+10.9	II %	0	76	+76
	LEVEL 4 %		.3	2.1	+1.8								

Number of		Schools									ND	1	
		Classrooms										4	
		Children		DNA				DNA				71	
		Teachers										4	
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %					A %				I %		21.7	
	LEVEL 2 %												
	LEVEL 3 %					B %				II %		22	
	LEVEL 4 %												

Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
		Classrooms	5	5	Ø		5	5	Ø		5	5	Ø
		Children	110	113	+3		111	117	+6		109	109	Ø
		Teachers	5	5	Ø		5	5	Ø		5	5	Ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		4.8	19.3	+14.5	A %	6.8	26.7	+19.9	I %	11	25.7	+14.7
	LEVEL 2 %		11.3	15.5	+4.2								
	LEVEL 3 %		1.6	6.3	+4.7	B %	12.9	57.2	+44.3	II %	0	8	+8
	LEVEL 4 %		1.9	4	+2.1								

Number of		Schools	ND	ND			ND	ND			ND	ND	
		Classrooms											
		Children											
		Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %					A %				I %			
	LEVEL 2 %												
	LEVEL 3 %					B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4 %												

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

CA

Dos Palos

DISTRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		ND	ND			1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	1	1							1	1	
			Children	9	9							26	26	
			Teachers	2	2							1	1	
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	11.7	11.7		A %				I %	0	0	
		LEVEL 2	2 %	5.8	5.8									
		LEVEL 3	3 %	6.7	6.7		B %				II %	0	0	
		LEVEL 4	4 %	2.2	2.2									
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		2	2	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	2	2			9	9	Ø		5	5	Ø
			Children	48	48			247	249	+2		124	124	Ø
			Teachers	2	2			9	9	Ø		5	5	Ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	0	0		A %	14.4	32.8	+18.4	I %	43.7	88	+44.3
		LEVEL 2	2 %	0	0									
		LEVEL 3	3 %	0	0		B %	6.4	7.6	+1.2	II %	0	0	Ø
		LEVEL 4	4 %	0	0									
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	5	5	Ø		3	3	Ø		4	4	Ø
			Children	146	147	+1		87	88	+1		114	114	Ø
			Teachers	3	3	Ø		2	2	Ø		4	4	Ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	2.3	30.2	+27.9	A %	8.1	24.4	+16.3	I %	18.7	31.2	+12.5
		LEVEL 2	2 %	7	23.6	+16.6								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	1.6	4.7	+3.1	B %	0	0	Ø	II %	0	0	Ø
		LEVEL 4	4 %	0	2.6	+2.6								
	Number of		Schools					1	Dropped out of Project Mar 1979			1	Dropped out of Project May 1979	
			Classrooms					1				3		
			Children					27				64		
			Teachers					1				2		
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %				A %	33.3			I %	19.5		
		LEVEL 2	2 %											
		LEVEL 3	3 %				B %	0			II %	8.5		
		LEVEL 4	4 %											

DNA

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

CA

DISTRICT: Carmel

		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø								
		Classrooms	3	3	Ø								
		Children	87	89	+2			DNA				DNA	
		Teachers	3	3	Ø								
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	%	6.4	9.3	+2.9	A %				I %			
	LEVEL 2	%	1	4	+3								
	LEVEL 3	%	1.7	2.8	+1.1	B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4	%	0	1.7	+1.7								

DISTRICT: El Cerrito

Number of		Schools	3	3	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
		Classrooms	11	12	+1		4	5	+1		2	2	Ø
		Children	255	296	+41		99	126	+27		55	45	-10
		Teachers	9	12	+3		4	5	+1		2	2	Ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	%	20.6	27.4	+6.8	A %	17.2	32.2	+15	I %	46.7	46.2	-.5
	LEVEL 2	%	6.2	30.8	+24.6								
	LEVEL 3	%	1.2	10.7	+9.5	B %	3.1	22.6	+19.5	II %	0	12.4	+12.4
	LEVEL 4	%	0	5.4	+5.4								

DISTRICT: Fowler

Number of		Schools					1	1	Ø				
		Classrooms					5	5	Ø				
		Children					153	157	+4				
		Teachers					6	6	Ø				
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	%				A %	3.2	11.2	+8	I %			
	LEVEL 2	%											
	LEVEL 3	%				B %	3.1	10.4	+10.3	II %			
	LEVEL 4	%											

DISTRICT: Kustine

Number of		Schools	ND	ND									
		Classrooms											
		Children											
		Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	%				A %				I %			
	LEVEL 2	%											
	LEVEL 3	%				B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4	%											

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

TRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of			Schools	1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-				
			Classrooms	4	5	+1		3	5	+2				
			Children	78	112	+34		70	125	+55				
			Teachers	4	5	+1		3	5	+2				
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1	%	7.2	11.2	+4	A %	6.1	12	+5.9	I %	DNA		
		2	%	1.4	8.4	+7								
		3	%	3.6	11.4	+7.8	B %	6.6	36.4	+29.8	II %			
		4	%	6.8	21.9	+15.1								

Number of			Schools	1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-
			Classrooms	6	6	-0-		5	5	-0-		4	4	-0-
			Children	149	153	+4		124	128	+4		119	119	-0-
			Teachers	2	2	-0-		1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1	%	16.2	36	+19.8	A %	3.8	11.3	+7.5	I %	0	0	-0-
		2	%	4.7	10	+5.3								
		3	%	2.3	4.8	+2.5	B %	.2	6.2	+6	II %	0	16.7	+16.7
		4	%	0	1.8	+1.8								

Number of			Schools	1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-				
			Classrooms	5	5	-0-		2	2	-0-				
			Children	102	86	-16		51	51	-0-				
			Teachers	6	6	-0-		3	3	-0-				
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1	%	7.4	8.8	+1.4	A %	23.1	22.6	-.5	I %	DNA		
		2	%	1	4.1	+3.1								
		3	%	.3	.4	+.1	B %	3.9	3.9	-0-	II %			
		4	%	3.2	3.7	+.5								

Number of			Schools	1	1	-0-		1	1	-0-				
			Classrooms	4	4	-0-		1	1	-0-				
			Children	66	69	+3		8	8	-0-				
			Teachers	4	4	-0-		1	1	-0-				
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1	%	14.9	28.3	+13.4	A %	38.8	52.7	+13.9	I %	DNA		
		2	%	4.6	13.5	+8.9								
		3	%	3	10.6	+7.6	B %	0	0	-0-	II %			
		4	%	0	3	+3								

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

STATE CA

DISTRICT Madera

		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of		Schools					ND	1					
		Classrooms						1					
		Children						30					
		Teachers		DNA				1			DNA		
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %				A %		23.7		I %			
		2 %											
		3 %				B %		8.4		II %			
		4 %											

DISTRICT Alexander

Number of		Schools					2	2	∅		2	2	∅
		Classrooms					5	5	∅		6	6	∅
		Children					109	113	+4		140	144	+4
		Teachers		DNA			5	5	∅		6	6	∅
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %				A %	10.7	28.3	+17.6	I %	10.7	57.2	+46.5
		2 %											
		3 %				B %	0	6.5	+6.5	II %	0	18	+18
		4 %											

DISTRICT Alamo

Number of		Schools	1	1	∅								
		Classrooms	3	4	+1								
		Children	80	97	+17								
		Teachers	3	4	+1		DNA				DNA		
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	6.6	19	+12.4	A %				I %			
		2 %	3	11.9	+8.9								
		3 %	4.4	6.8	+2.4	B %				II %			
		4 %	1.7	2.9	+1.2								

DISTRICT Palmdale

Number of		Schools	1	1	∅								
		Classrooms	1	1									
		Children	30	30									
		Teachers	1	1			DNA				DNA		
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	2	2		A %				I %			
		2 %	0	0									
		3 %	0	0		B %				II %			
		4 %	0	0									

DNA = Does Not Apply ∅ = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 — by Program, by District, by State.

CA

DISTRICT

		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan–May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan–May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan–May
Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø								
		Classrooms	4	4	Ø								
		Children	33	33	Ø								
		Teachers	4	4	Ø								
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	8.4	18.4	+10	A %	DNA			I %	DNA		
	LEVEL 2	2 %	1.2	3.4	+2.2								
	LEVEL 3	3 %	0	.4	+.4	B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4	4 %	0	0	Ø								

Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		ND	Dropped after Feb 1979					
		Classrooms	5	5	Ø								
		Children	40	47	+7								
		Teachers	5	5	Ø								
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	7.5	10.9	+3.4	A %				I %			
	LEVEL 2	2 %	.6	3.1	+2.5								
	LEVEL 3	3 %	0	0	Ø	B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4	4 %	0	0	Ø								

Number of		Schools											
		Classrooms											
		Children											
		Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %				A %				I %			
	LEVEL 2	2 %											
	LEVEL 3	3 %				B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4	4 %											

Number of		Schools											
		Classrooms											
		Children											
		Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %				A %				I %			
	LEVEL 2	2 %											
	LEVEL 3	3 %				B %				II %			
	LEVEL 4	4 %											

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

DISTRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
	Number of		Schools	2	2	Ø		1	1	Ø		2	2	Ø
			Classrooms	12	12	Ø		5	6	+1		10	10	Ø
			Children	196	214	+18		123	159	+36		152	223	+71
			Teachers	12	12	Ø		5	6	+1		10	10	Ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	4.3	5	+.7	A %	23	36.5	+13.5	I %	10.5	30.7	+20.2
		LEVEL 2	2 %	2.8	3.8	+1								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	.6	3.8	+3.2	B %	2.3	15.5	+13.2	II %	0	35.7	+35.7
		LEVEL 4	4 %	1	4.8	+3.8								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	6	6	Ø		2	2	Ø		3	5	+2
			Children	104	110	+6		20	21	+1		64	114	+50
			Teachers	5	5	Ø		2	2	Ø		2	3	+1
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	7.4	19.6	+12.2	A %	1.1	2.6	+1.5	I %	0	34.7	+34.7
		LEVEL 2	2 %	.9	12.2	+11.3								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	1.7	6.1	+4.4	B %	6.5	47.1	+40.6	II %	23.5	71	+47.5
		LEVEL 4	4 %	8.6	8	-.6								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	10	10	Ø		5	5	Ø		3	3	Ø
			Children	164	159	-5		78	78	Ø		50	50	Ø
			Teachers	11	12	+1		5	5	Ø		4	4	Ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	15.4	17.6	+2.2	A %	28.3	32.5	+4.2	I %	50	97	+47
		LEVEL 2	2 %	11	15.7	+4.7								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	.5	8.2	+7.7	B %	11.2	28.4	+17.2	II %	0	0	Ø
		LEVEL 4	4 %	2	4.8	+2.8								
	Number of		Schools	3	3	Ø		2	2	Ø		ND	ND	
			Classrooms	11	11	Ø		9	9	Ø				
			Children	239	249	+10		177	186	+9				
			Teachers	13	13	Ø		9	9	Ø				
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	1.7	3.4	+1.7	A %	4.2	16.7	+12.5	I %			
		LEVEL 2	2 %	2	4.9	+2.9								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	.3	1	+.7	B %	6.9	17.6	+10.7	II %			
		LEVEL 4	4 %	0	0	Ø								

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

DISTRICT

		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		2	2	Ø		1	1	Ø
		Classrooms	4	5	+1		7	7	Ø		6	6	Ø
		Children	117	142	+25		174	176	+2		157	159	+2
		Teachers	4	5	+1		7	7	Ø		6	6	Ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		4.4	4.8	+.4	A %	20.7	27.1	+6.4	I %	51.5	64	+12.5
	LEVEL 2 %		3.9	7.4	+3.5								
	LEVEL 3 %		.6	3.3	+2.7	B %	10.9	35.4	+24.5	II %	0	43.7	+43.7
	LEVEL 4 %		.6	1.5	+.9								

Number of	Schools		1	3	+2		1	2	+1		ND	ND	
	Classrooms		1	5	+4		1	3	+2				
	Children		21	92	+71		12	55	+43				
	Teachers		1	6	+5		1	4	+3				
% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %		4.7	7.3	+2.6	A %	8.3	10.2	+1.9	I %			
	2 %		4.1	5.4	+1.3								
	3 %		0	1.1	+1.1	B %	9.1	7.5	−1.6	II %			
	4 %		5.7	1.3	−4.4								

Number of	Schools		4	4	Ø		3	3	Ø		2	2	Ø
	Classrooms		13	13	Ø		5	6	+1		3	3	Ø
	Children		237	250	+23		109	140	+31		53	54	+1
	Teachers		13	13	Ø		6	7	+1		3	3	Ø
% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %		18.9	31.2	+12.3	A %	16.1	27	+10.9	I %	2.2	51.5	+49.3
	2 %		3.8	12.2	+8.4								
	3 %		3.7	4.6	+.9	B %	.2	3.4	+3.2	II %	0	0	Ø
	4 %		0	2.7	+2.7								

Number of	Schools												
	Classrooms												
	Children												
	Teachers												
% of Pupil Completion LEVEL	1 %					A %				I %			
	2 %												
	3 %					B %				II %			
	4 %												

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

98

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 — by Program, by District, by State.

NM

DISTRICT Los Alamos

		BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of		Schools	4	4	ø		ND	dropped out of BCPM May '79			1	1	ø
		Classrooms	32	32	ø						11	11	ø
		Children	762	812	+ 50						263	280	+17
		Teachers	31	31	ø						11	11	ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	9.6	13.2	+3.6	A %				I %	15.7	33.2	+17.5
	LEVEL 2	2 %	7.6	14.3	+6.7								
	LEVEL 3	3 %	4.4	9.9	+5.5	B %				II %	16.2	23.2	+ 7
	LEVEL 4	4 %	2.7	8.2	+5.5								

Los Alamos Reading

Number of		Schools	1	1	ø						1	1	ø
		Classrooms	2	2	ø						5	5	ø
		Children	28	28	ø						110	110	ø
		Teachers	1	1	ø			DNA			4	4	ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	20.1	20.1	ø	A %				I %	5	5	ø
	LEVEL 2	2 %	3.6	3.6	ø								
	LEVEL 3	3 %	19.9	19.9	ø	B %				II %	0	0	ø
	LEVEL 4	4 %	0	0	ø								

Los Alamos Reading

Number of		Schools	2	2	ø		2	2	ø		2	2	ø
		Classrooms	8	8	ø		8	8	ø		6	7	+1
		Children	215	217	+2		212	213	+1		158	186	+28
		Teachers	8	8	ø		8	8	ø		6	7	+1
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	7.8	13.4	+5.6	A %	11.3	31	+19.7	I %	8.5	28.7	+20.2
	LEVEL 2	2 %	3.5	16.4	+12.9								
	LEVEL 3	3 %	9	14.6	+5.6	B %	10.7	33.5	+22.8	II %	15.7	46.2	+30.5
	LEVEL 4	4 %	5.7	12.2	+6.5								

Los Alamos Reading

Number of		Schools	2	2	ø		ND	1			ND	ND	
		Classrooms	6	6	ø			2					
		Children	117	116	-1			44					
		Teachers	5	5	ø			2					
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	17.5	36.6	+19.1	A %		43.8		I %			
	LEVEL 2	2 %	2.4	17.8	+15.4								
	LEVEL 3	3 %	0	1.6	+1.6	B %		58.1		II %			
	LEVEL 4	4 %	0	0	ø								

89

DNA = Does Not Apply ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

DISTRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan–May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan–May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan–May
	Number of		Schools					1	1	ø		1	1	ø
			Classrooms					6	6	ø		6	6	ø
			Children					114	117	+ 3		117	117	ø
			Teachers					5	5	ø		1	1	ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		DNA			A %	11.1	18.2	+ 7.1	I %	8.7	33	+24.3
		LEVEL 2 %												
		LEVEL 3 %					B %	6.4	13.9	+ 7.5	II %	15	53.5	+38.5
		LEVEL 4 %												
	Number of		Schools	5	5	ø		5	5	ø		3	3	ø
			Classrooms	22	24	+2		17	17	ø		8	8	ø
			Children	487	519	+32		392	392	ø		181	182	+1
			Teachers	22	24	+ 2		22	20	- 2		8	8	ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %		13.6	20	+6.4	A %	19.7	25.3	+5.6	I %	30	29.7	-.3
		LEVEL 2 %		8.5	14.4	+5.9								
		LEVEL 3 %		3	9.9	+6.9	B %	16.4	20.2	+3.8	II %	24.2	51.7	+27.5
		LEVEL 4 %		.7	4.2	+3.5								
	Number of		Schools											
			Classrooms											
			Children											
			Teachers											
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %					A %				I %			
		LEVEL 2 %												
		LEVEL 3 %					B %				II %			
		LEVEL 4 %												
	Number of		Schools											
			Classrooms											
			Children											
			Teachers											
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1 %					A %				I %			
		LEVEL 2 %												
		LEVEL 3 %					B %				II %			
		LEVEL 4 %												

90

DNA = Does Not Apply ø = No Change ND = No Data

X Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 — by Program, by District, by State.

TRICT			EOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan–May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan–May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan–May
	Number of		Schools					2	2	∅				
			Classrooms					10	10	∅				
			Children					221	221	∅				
			Teachers					8	8	∅				
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %				A %	13.3	24.2	+10.9	I %			
			2 %											
			3 %				B %	9.6	23.7	+14.1	II %			
			4 %											
	Number of		Schools	6	6	∅		1	1	∅		ND	ND	
			Classrooms	12	12	∅		1	2	+1				
			Children	302	309	+7		33	63	+30				
			Teachers	12	7	-5		1	2	+1				
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	7.8	14.6	+6.8	A %	34	28.3	-5.7	I %			
			2 %	3.8	10.5	+6.7								
			3 %	2.4	5.6	+3.2	B %	0	0	∅	II %			
			4 %	2	5.5	+3.5								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	∅		1	1	∅		1	1	∅
			Classrooms	4	4	∅		4	4	∅		4	4	∅
			Children	111	111	∅		120	119	-1		115	119	+4
			Teachers	4	4	∅		4	4	∅		4	4	∅
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	29.9	36.5	+6.6	A %	5.5	32.7	+27.2	I %	25.2	49.7	+24.5
			2 %	9.7	31.3	+21.6								
			3 %	3.8	5.7	+1.9	B %	11.6	29.4	+17.8	II %	12.2	37.5	+25.3
			4 %	0	0	∅								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	∅								
			Classrooms	6	6	∅								
			Children	183	187	+4								
			Teachers	6	6	∅								
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	0	5.9	+5.9	A %				I %			
			2 %	0	6.3	+6.3								
			3 %	0	2.1	+2.1	B %				II %			
			4 %	0	1.6	+1.6								

91

DNA = Does Not Apply ∅ = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

DISTRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	4	4	Ø		4	4	Ø		4	4	Ø
			Children	107	107	Ø		107	108	+1		107	108	+1
			Teachers	4	4	Ø		4	4	Ø		4	4	Ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	33.1	41.4	+8.3	A %	24.8	49.4	+24.6	I %	21.7	41.2	+19.5
		LEVEL 2	2 %	4.2	27.4	+23.2								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	9.8	15.1	+5.3	B %	13.7	44.4	+30.7	II %	11.7	33.5	+21.8
		LEVEL 4	4 %	0	4.5	+4.5								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	6	6	Ø		2	2	Ø		8	10	+2
			Children	141	144	+3		60	60	Ø		159	207	+48
			Teachers	6	6	Ø		1	1	Ø		3	4	+1
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	27.4	28.4	+1.0	A %	63.6	63.6	Ø	I %	16	44.7	+28.7
		LEVEL 2	2 %	16.4	22.8	+6.4								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	6	16.4	+10.4	B %	14.8	42.2	+27.4	II %	0	0	Ø
		LEVEL 4	4 %	.4	13.6	+13.2								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Classrooms	2	2	Ø		2	2	Ø		1	1	Ø
			Children	44	44	Ø		45	44	-1		23	23	Ø
			Teachers	2	2	Ø		2	2	Ø		1	1	Ø
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	20.7	27	+6.3	A %	20.8	31.1	+10.3	I %	0	0	Ø
		LEVEL 2	2 %	5	11.9	+6.9								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	0	2.4	+2.4	B %	4.4	16.7	+12.3	II %	0	0	Ø
		LEVEL 4	4 %	0	1.1	+1.1								
	Number of		Schools	1	1	Ø		1	1	Ø				
			Classrooms	3	3	Ø		3	3	Ø				
			Children	85	84	-1		85	85	Ø				
			Teachers	3	3	Ø		3	3	Ø				
	% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL 1	1 %	25.2	27.5	+2.3	A %	7	25.8	+18.8	I %			
		LEVEL 2	2 %	6	9.2	+3.2								
		LEVEL 3	3 %	3.1	12.6	+9.5	B %	2.9	31.3	+28.4	II %			
		LEVEL 4	4 %	0	4.4	+4.4								

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

TX

TRICT

			BOLaR 1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM 1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R 1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of	Schools		1	1	ø				1	1	ø
	Classrooms		10	10	ø				5	5	ø
	Children		223	222	- 1				144	161	+ 17
	Teachers		10	10	ø				2	2	ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	24.3	51.4	+27.1	A %			I % 14	48,5	+34.5
		2 %	3.9	27	+23,1						
		3 %	3	8.6	+ 5.6	B %			II % 0	34.2	+34.2
		4 %	0	.4	+ .4						

Number of	Schools		2	2	ø		2	2	ø	2	2	ø
	Classrooms		7	7	ø		4	4	ø	6	6	ø
	Children		239	258	+ 19		157	157	ø	179	179	ø
	Teachers		7	7	ø		4	4	ø	6	6	ø
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	20.7	34.4	+13.7	A %	0	0	ø	I % 0	0	ø
		2 %	5.4	20.9	+15.5							
		3 %	2.5	8.3	+ 5.8	B %	0	0	ø	II % 0	0	ø
		4 %	3.8	8.7	+ 4.9							

Number of	Schools		1	1	ø		ND	ND			
	Classrooms		4	4	ø						
	Children		115	111	- 4						
	Teachers		4	4	ø						
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %	19.2	28.7	+ 9.0	A %			I %		
		2 %	8.3	19.5	+11.2						
		3 %	3.8	25.3	+21.5	B %	↓	↓	II %		
		4 %	0	18.6	+18.6						

Number of	Schools		ND	1			ND	ND			
	Classrooms		↓	4							
	Children			111							
	Teachers			4							
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %		5.8		A %			I %		
		2 %		21							
		3 %		28.5		B %	↓	↓	II %		
		4 %	↓	23.5							

DNA = Does Not Apply ø = No Change ND = No Data

Changes in Program Utilization and Percentage of Pupil Completion from January 1979 to May 1979 -- by Program, by District, by State.

DISTRICT			BOLaR	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	BCPM	1979 Jan.	1979 May	Changes Jan-May	T&R	1979 Jan	1979 May	Changes Jan-May
Number of			Schools	2	2	-0-		1	1	-0-				
			Classrooms	9	9	-0-		3	3	-0-				
			Children	280	281	+1		50	50	-0-				
			Teachers	8	8	-0-		1	1	-0-				
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %		24.3	50.8	+26.5	A %	42.8	89.1	+46.3	I %	D	NA	
		2 %		14.2	47.6	+33.4								
		3 %		15.7	26.7	+11	B %	0	23.8	+23.8	II %			
		4 %		.5	17.1	+16.6								
Number of			Schools											
			Classrooms											
			Children											
			Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %					A %				I %			
		2 %												
		3 %					B %				II %			
		4 %												
Number of			Schools											
			Classrooms											
			Children											
			Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %					A %				I %			
		2 %												
		3 %					B %				II %			
		4 %												
Number of			Schools											
			Classrooms											
			Children											
			Teachers											
% of Pupil Completion	LEVEL	1 %					A %				I %			
		2 %												
		3 %					B %				II %			
		4 %												

DNA = Does Not Apply Ø = No Change ND = No Data

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and 1979-80 by Program, by State

ARIZONA

DISTRICT	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R	
	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	*1979-80
Avondale	X	0	X	0	0	0
Bonita	X	X	X	0	X	X
Glendale	X	X	X	X	X	X
Globe	X	0	X	0	X	X
Kyrene	X	X	X	X	X	0
Laveen	X	X	X	X	X	X
Naco	X	X	X	X	X	X
Parker	X	X	X	0	X	0
Peoria	X	X	X	X	0	0
Santa Cruz	X	0	X	0	0	X
Solomonville	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sunnyside	X	0	X	0	X	0
TOTAL	12	8	12	6	9	7

*1979-80 T&R Materials that were sent to Districts are actually from SEDL/BSLC's 1978-79 inventory.

Pg 91 had been removed

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and 1979-80 by Program, by State

CALIFORNIA

DISTRICT	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R	
	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	*1979-80
Biola	X	0	X	0	X	0
Brawley	X	X	X	X	X	X
Calexico	X	X	X	X	X	X
Calipatria (dropped)	0	0	X	0	X	0
Earlimart	X	X	0	0	0	0
El Centro	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fowler	0	0	X	X	0	0
Gustine	X	0	0	0	0	0
Heber	X	X	X	X	0	0
Imperial	X	X	X	0	X	X
Kings River	X	X	X	0	0	0
Le Grand	X	X	X	X	0	0
Madera	0	0	X	X	0	0
Mendota	0	0	X	0	X	X
Planada	X	X	0	0	0	0
Selma	X	0	X	0	0	0
Porterville	X	X	0	0	0	0
Woodville	X	X	X	0	0	0
TOTAL	14	11	14	7	7	5

*1979-80 T&R Materials that were sent to Districts are actually from SEDL/BSLC's 1978-79 inventory.

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and 1979-80 by Program, by State

COLORADO

DISTRICT	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R	
	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	*1979-80
Brighton	X	X	X	0	X	X
Centennial	X	0	X	0	X	0
Ft. Lupton	X	X	X	X	X	X
Greeley	X	0	X	0	X	0
Harrison	X	X	X	0	X	X
Huerfano	X	0	0	0	0	0
Trinidad	X	X	X	X	X	X
TOTAL	7	4	6	2	6	4

*1979-80 T&R Materials that were sent to Districts are actually from SEDL/BSLC's 1978-79 inventory.

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and 1979-80 by Program, by State

NEW MEXICO

DISTRICT	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R	
	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	*1979-80
Gadsden	X	X	0	0	X	0
Lordsburg	X	X	0	0	X	0
Pecos	X	X	X	X	X	X
Portales	X	X	X	X	X	0
Raton	0	0	X	X	X	X
W. Las Vegas	X	X	X	X	X	X
TOTAL	5	5	4	4	6	3

*1979-80 T&R Materials that were sent to Districts are actually from SEDL/BSLC's 1978-79 inventory.

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Sites Receiving Materials in 1978-79 and 1979-80 by Program, by State

TEXAS

DISTRICT	BOLaR		BCPM		T&R	
	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	1979-80	1978-79	*1979-80
Alice	0	0	X	X	0	0
Eagle Pass	X	X	X	0	X	0
Edcouch-Elsa	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hondo	X	X	0	0	0	0
La Feria	X	X	X	X	X	X
La Joya	X	X	X	X	X	X
Levelland	X	X	X	X	X	0
Los Fresnos	X	X	X	0	0	0
Mission	X	X	0	0	X	0
Progreso	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rio Hondo	X	0	X	0	0	0
San Benito	X	X	X	0	0	0
Zapata	X	X	X	X	0	0
TOTAL	12	11	11	7	7	4

*1979-80 T&R Materials that were sent to Districts are actually from SEDL/BSLC's 1978-79 inventory.

ATTACHMENT E

Persons Attending SEDL Training by Roles,
Numbers submitting BSLC Reports, Numbers conducting CSE Testing

ARIZONA

District	Persons Attending Training			#'s Submitting Reports*		#'s Conducting CSE Testing	
	# of Teachers	# of Principals	# of Coordinators	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL
Avondale	7	0	0	2	5	0	2
Bonita	3	0	1	3	2	0	0
Glendale	48	1	1	4	1	0	0
Globe	4	0	0	3	1	0	0
Kyrene	3	1**	-	1	14	0	0
Laveen	2	0	1	1	21	0	0
Naco	14	0	1	5	6	0	0
Parker	25	0	0	7	7	0	0
Peoria	11	0	1	6	3	2	0
Santa Cruz	5	0	1	4	5	0	0
Solomonville	7	1**	-	5	4	2	1
Sunnyside	32	0	0	19	20	3	2
TOTAL FOR ARIZONA	161	3	6	60	89	7	5

*Reports include PPIFs, CSE Survey Forms & District Information Forms
**Also Coordinator

Pg 97 removed

ATTACHMENT E

Persons Attending SEDL Training by Roles,
Numbers submitting BSLC Reports, Numbers conducting CSE Testing

CALIFORNIA

District	Persons Attending Training			#'s Submitting Reports*		#'s Conducting CSE Testing	
	# of Teachers	# of Princi-pals	# of Coord-inators	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL
Biola	9	1**	-	6	3	0	0
Brawley	6	0	1	2	20	0	0
Calexico	8	0	0	5	0	0	0
Earlimart	7	0	1	7	0	5	2
El Centro	32	1	1	12	14	0	0
Fowler	2	0	1	3	14	1	4
Gustine	0	0	1	0	6	0	0
Heber	8	0	1	3	6	0	0
Imperial	8	0	0	4	5	0	0
Kings River	2	0	1	2	5	1	4
Le Grand	9	0	0	4	7	2	2
Madera	3	0	1	1	7	1	7
Mendota	6	0	1	5	6	2	2
Planada	11	0	1	8	1	4	0
Selma	3	0	1	2	1	0	0
Porterville	11	0	1	6	4	3	1
Woodville	6	0	1	3	5	2	3
TOTAL FOR CALIFORNIA	131	2	13	73	104	21	25

*Reports include PPIFs, CSE Survey Forms & District Information Forms
**Also Coordinator

ATTACHMENT E

Persons Attending SEDL Training by Roles,
Numbers submitting BSLC Reports, Numbers conducting CSE Testing

COLORADO

District	Persons Attending Training			#'s Submitting Reports*		#'s Conducting CSE Testing	
	# of Teachers	# of Principals	# of Coordinators	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL
Brighton	3	0	1	1	50	0	0
Centennial	3	1**	-	3	9	2	3
Ft. Lupton	21	0	1	12	15	9	9
Greeley	9	1	1	8	18	4	5
Harrison	20	0	1	8	5	10	9
Huerfano	12	1	1	2	22	0	0
Trinidad	14	1	1	7	15	4	4
TOTAL FOR COLORADO	82	4	6	41	134	29	30

*Reports include PPIFs, CSE Survey Forms & District Information Forms
**Also Coordinator

ATTACHMENT E

Persons Attending SEDL Training by Roles,
Numbers submitting BSLC Reports, Numbers conducting CSE Testing

NEW MEXICO

District	Persons Attending Training			#'s Submitting Reports*		#'s Conducting CSE Testing	
	# of Teachers	# of Principals	# of Coordinators	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL
Gasden	41	1	1	18	30	0	0
Lordsburg	2	0	1	3	3	0	0
Pecos	7	1**	-	8	10	4	5
Portales	11	1	1	9	5	4	1
Raton	1	0	1	2	10	0	4
W. Las Vegas	39	0	1	28	23	0	0
TOTAL FOR NEW MEXICO	101	3	5	68	81	8	10

*Reports include PPIFs, CSE Survey Forms & District Information Forms
**Also Coordinator

ATTACHMENT E

Persons Attending SEDL Training by Roles,
Numbers submitting BSLC Reports, Numbers conducting CSE Testing

TEXAS

District	Persons Attending Training			#'s Submitting Reports*		#'s Conducting CSE Testing	
	# of Teachers	# of Princi-pals	# of Coord-inators	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL	Trained by SEDL	Not Trained by SEDL
Alice	2	0	0	1	19	0	0
Eagle Pass	5	0	1	0	27	0	0
Edcouch-Elsa	27	1	1	11	10	2	5
Hondo	9	0	0	6	6	0	0
La Feria	16	0	1	4	5	1	3
La Joya	20	0	1	9	14	0	0
Levelland	14	0	1	6	0	0	0
Los Fresnos	3	0	0	0	9	0	2
Mission	31	0	0	10	19	3	4
Progreso	3	0	1	0	24	0	0
Rio Hondo	6	0	0	0	7	0	0
San Benito	2	1	1	2	4	2	2
Zapata	3	0	1	2	12	0	0
TOTAL FOR TEXAS	141	2	8	51	156	8	16

*Reports include PPIFs, CSE Survey Forms & District Information Forms